The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1906.

The Week.

The word "levity" which Senator Dolliver applied on Friday to the attitude of the other members of the Interstate Commerce Committee toward rate legislation, is an odd characterization for a group of men who average fifty-eight years of age, and have served an average of nine years apiece in the most dignified body in the world. The particular Senator to whom the reproach was uttered, Mr. Aldrich, outranks all the rest of the committee, and has served more than four times as long as his Western critic. But be that as it may, the incident at least shows the potency of this legislation in stirring up ill-feeling. The committee discussion probably foreshadows on a small scale what will happen later on the floor of the Senate. When we have such a chance for a prophecy according to the simple rule of three, there is an irresistible temptation to make it. The committee intended to report a bill ten days after the session began. That would have been December 14. The date now set for the report—nobody knows what the bill will be—is February 16. Thus it took seven and seven-tenths times as long as any one expected for the committee to settle the bill. We have heard some talk of a month's debate in open Senate. If that represents the present expectations, then a vote may actually be looked for on or about the twenty-second day of September. Mr. Williams said that the House Democrats were willing to wait till Christmas, if necessary, for the Senate to do something. They may have to.

If the set speeches in the House on the railway bill were perfunctory, the running debates, and especially the offering of amendments, when the bill was put on its passage, had a good deal of interest. One has only to read the proceedings of February 7 to discover in what a purposed ambiguity the Hepburn bill was left. For example, as we remark elsewhere, there was the sharpest difference of opinion whether the bill covered the express companies or not. Representative Townsend maintained that it did; Mr. Hepburn was as positive that it did not. In order to remove all uncertainty, Representative Underwood moved an amendment explicitly putting express companies under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. On the division, the vote was exactly divided—129 ayes to 129 noes. Then came the vote by tellers, and the amendment was beaten, 119 to 146. In the interval there must have been some effective work by the friends of the companies. But all other attempts to clarify the bill were likewise fruitless. The right of judicial review and the power over differential rates were both left in the fogbank where Hepburn placed them. As for the amendment forbidding the railroads to give free passes, it was beaten 111 to 147. That is pretty good evidence of the extent to which the House is eaten up with zeal for railroad reform.

In the debate on Wednesday week, Senator Bailey made short work of Senator Patterson's professions of undying hostility to caucus rule. Senator Patterson, cried Bailey, "owes his seat in this house to a caucus." Moreover, Patterson, before his election, had pledged himself to enter the Democratic caucus, and had declared to his constituents that nothing could be done by a man who stayed out of caucus. Finally, in Democratic caucus two years ago, Patterson had voted for the resolution making a two-thirds vote binding—a resolution which he now regards as cruel, coercive, and undemocratic. When confronted with these facts, the Senator from Colorado was forced to admit them: "I cannot gainsay the record, but it seems that ample preparations have been made to overwhelm me by reason of the stand I have taken." The preparations which overwhelmed Senator Patterson have probably also overwhelmed the San Domingo treaty. The votes of at least four Democrats are needed to confirm it. The bitterness of the late discussion is likely to solidify the Democratic opposition, so that not more than one or two Democrats at most will go with the Republicans. In the event of failure of the treaty, the next step will be an attempt to carry out the purpose of the President by a joint resolution, which requires a mere majority in each house. As to the legality of this method, some of the ablest lawyers among the Republican Senators express grave doubts.

At the very moment when Administration Senators are protesting that the San Domingo treaty will not be used as a precedent, it is used as a precedent. Hayti is in trouble about her foreign debt, and recourse is at once had by the creditors, not to Port-au-Prince, but to Washington. Uncle Sam, in his new rôle of liquidator of all the bad debts in this hemisphere, is called upon to arrange the affair. This was inevitable. As soon as we begin to act as receiver and guardian for one bankrupt republic, the disordered finances of all the others will infallibly be brought to us. We know of no single argument advanced for our intervention in San Domingo which does not apply, or could not be made to apply, to all other republics in arrear and in difficulty between us and Cape Horn. And the greater part of their debts, like those of San Domingo, is practically of the nature of gambling debts. Speculators have simply taken chances as in a lottery, and now we are to guarantee the lottery. President Roosevelt, who a little time ago was speaking complacently in his message about his "police power" over all disorderly republics, and was reported by his friends as determined to straighten out the whole lot of them, now gives it to be understood that San Domingo will be the very last imprudence of the kind. But logic is logic, and a precedent is a precedent, even in a government by non-sequiturs. Hayti's creditors may be troublesome callers at the State Department, just at this juncture, but we may be sure that, if the President's Dominican policy is adopted, they are but the first of a long tine.

In view of Mr. Wallace's clear statement before the Senate committee, how exaggerated appears Secretary Taft's celestial rage of last July! Mr. Wallace declares that he threw up his Isthmian job because he found himself hampered by a person without official standing, though apparently with plenary authority in Isthmian matters. For declining to serve under these conditions, Mr. Wallace was roundly reprimanded as a recreant, and held up to the youth of the land as a horrible example of sordid commercialism. The case is instructive because it shows the passion with which convictions are held at Washington, and because it betrays a marked tendency to regard criticism or dissent of any kind as treason. Now this point of view, whatever its justification may be, is eminently un-American. The right to grumble is one of the unwritten rights of the Constitution. Our Government has always taken the ground that the freest expression of discontent is salutary, and that not the speech or the state of mind of our citizens is to be regulated, but simply their actions. But the Roosevelt Administration has changed all that. It takes a passionate interest in the thoughts of men; it would apparently enforce the French doctrine that a citizen must not be merely well-doing, but well-thinking. On no other hypothesis can we account for the fact that the withdrawal of a Government engineer should be accompanied by a lengthy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reprimand that constitutes a veritable curiosity among state papers; that a journalist should be appointed to guide public opinion aright on canal matters; that the attempt should be made to centralize the distribution of news from the Government departments; that the catching of an obscure reporter in receipt of a petty bribe should occasion a Presidential utterance on "poisoning the public mind." All these instances show that we are leaving far behind old-fashioned, go-as-you-please, American notions of liberty of speech and opinion, and are in a fair way to create a new Federal misdemeanor which, according to circumstances, may be called *lèse*-Theodore, or *lèse*-Panama.

We hear from time to time that American rule in the Philippines is not gaining popularity, but rather losing the little that it had in the beginning. In an article in the *Independent*, the wife of Congressman Parsons tells one of the reasons why. Mrs. Parsons was one of the Congressional party that visited the islands with Secretary Taft last summer. If all the members of the party have brought back as large a stock of political philosophy as this lady acquired, the result cannot fail to be helpful. There is certainly more of light and leading in her brief communication than we have seen in any other deliverance from those daring voyagers. Mrs. Parsons finds it to be a fact that the Americans in the islands do not associate with the natives, not even with the intellectual classes, but hold themselves aloof from and above the Filipinos. They consider the latter their inferiors, and make them so understand. This aloofness is due not to lack of refinement, of education, or of wealth, but to color. It is a reproduction or reappearance of the race prejudice which exists so largely in the United States. Mrs. Parsons calls it "race snobbishness," but this is an infelicity. Thackeray, our greatest authority on snobs, never mentioned one who was particular about complexions. The race prejudice which exists against black men here, and against brown men in Manila, is not classified in the Book of Snobs at all. It is much more pervasive, ineradicable, and hard to deal with. It is not amenable to ridicule, and it goeth not out by fasting and prayer. But all this does not detract from Mrs. Parsons's article, which goes to the very root of our unpopularity among the Filipinos. We have a contempt for them on account of their color, regardless of their mental or moral attainments, and they resent it. Now, since they cannot possibly change their color, however much they may improve their minds and characters, it follows that we shall always hold them in contempt, and that they will always hate us, unless, in the process of the suns, we lay aside race prejudice. Will any modern Imperialist tell us about what time we may expect this "reform within the party"?

Lord North is reported to have said at the outbreak of the American Revolution that he did not know whether his generals would frighten the Americans, but that they certainly frightened him when he came to consider their qualifications. Something of the same feeling must come over any one who studies the list of our regular army major-generals as they stand after several years of what the *Sun* rightly calls "promotion by selection as a result of favoritism and pull." They are Arthur MacArthur, Henry C. Corbin, James F. Wade, Leonard Wood, John F. Weston, Adolphus W. Greely, and Frederick D. Grant. Of these Gen. MacArthur is undoubtedly an able soldier, who seems, however, to have lost his ambition for hard work; his promotion to the lieutenant-generalcy on the retirement from that position of Gens. Bates and Corbin is certain. Gen. Wade, who is anxious to retire at once, is the only one of the seven major-generals who passed through every grade of the line and commanded a regular regiment. Of the others, MacArthur, Corbin, Wood, and Greely left regimental duty as captains, and Weston as a first lieutenant. MacArthur and Corbin served in the adjutant-general's department; Greely as signal officer, and Wood as a medical officer. Grant's total regimental service aggregates not over eight months. This includes a brief period with the Fourth Cavalry in 1872 and six weeks as colonel of the Fourteenth New York Volunteers in 1898. The rest of his regular army service comprises eight years on the staff of Gen. Sheridan prior to his resignation in 1881, and the time he has spent as brigadier-general since his appointment in 1901.

In other words, as the list of major-generals stands, there is only one officer, MacArthur, who could really command the confidence of troops by reason of actual experience and demonstrated ability. Weston is an excellent officer, with the respect of his comrades, but no man, however able, who has spent thirty years in the Subsistence Department as a commissary officer, can be looked upon as competent to manœuvre at once large bodies of troops. Gen. Wade's experience has been merely routine. Brig.-Gen. J. Franklin Bell, who is to be chief of staff in the fall, will probably fill the vacancy to be created by the retirement of Gen. Bates on April 14, and is regarded as an exceptionally brilliant officer, who won his rapid advance by unusually good work in the Philippines, where he served as staff officer and colonel of a volunteer regiment. But even Gen. Bell lacks experience in handling troops. The recent army manœuvres showed very clearly his limitations as well as those of Generals Barry and Bliss, who were also promoted from low rank in the line. As an old colonel recently expressed it, after they had given an order, they were at a loss if circumstances changed. They had not the experience to enable them to handle their men promptly and rearrange their plans at a moment's notice. In the list of brigadier-generals there is not much encouragement. Indeed, if nothing else should incline Mr. Roosevelt to keep the peace, a contemplation of his line generals ought to. Of the entire twenty-three, two, Funston and Grant, were made generals outright; seven came from staff departments, four were jumped from captaincies, and only ten rose through all the regimental grades from lieutenant to colonel. And of the latter class no less than eight will retire for age before the end of 1907.

President Roosevelt dined with his "campaign committee" on Friday evening—Chairman Cortelyou, Treasurer Bliss, and the others. The report is that "congratulations" were exchanged. We must think, however, that condolences were rather the order of the day, with planning how to make restitution of the money wrongfully taken by the committee from insurance companies. We had next day the opinion of the Attorney-General of the State of New York that all the funds paid over by the insurance presidents to Mr. Roosevelt's treasurer were illegal contributions, and are clearly recoverable. President Roosevelt, it will be remembered, has not yet said a word in public reprobation of the course of his committee in soliciting and accepting, to aid in his election, money that rightfully belonged to widows and orphans; but his long silence must mean that he has been waiting simply in order to complete arrangements for the Republican committee to pay back all the sums which it was a shame to have taken at all. Consequently, we look for an early announcement from the White House that it will not be necessary for Attorney-General Mayer to sue for the return of the insurance campaign contributions, since the President has quietly made up the amount among his rich Republican friends, and will see that it is repaid to the policyholders from whom it was originally stolen.

Andrew Hamilton, lobbyist, received $1,347,382.41 from the New York Life Insurance Company. This is the fresh sensation with which the Fowler investigating committee shocks us. How much Hamilon received from other companies we do not yet know. The Fowler committee was able to get at material to which the legislative committee seems not to have had access—accounts of various branch offices, especially that at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris. From Paris alone Hamilton drew about $144,000 on the cabled orders of President John A. McCall. In fact, Hamilton tapped the treasury at every possible outlet—for "legal services," for various disbursements, for the "home-office annex," for tax payments, for work with legislatures. Whenever money was to be spent, Hamilton took toll. What he did with all this money was a mystery. A few thousands were passed on to President McCall; but the why and wherefore of those transactions is another dark secret. Certain notes, made by Hamilton and endorsed by either President McCall or his brother, Justice Edward E. McCall, were finally paid from the funds of the company; but the Fowler committee is unable to discover any plausible reason. This juggling of accounts casts the gravest suspicion upon President McCall's integrity. The plundered policyholders, who can find neither head nor tail to this hocus-pocus, inevitably ask whether any of the money handed over so freely, and without accounting, to McCall's "boyhood friend" by McCall's order, ever trickled back into the pockets of McCall or his kin.

Revised plans for the so-called "National Theatre" in this city put that project in a more favorable light than did the first accounts. These, it now appears, were both ill-advised and misleading. They contained features which were socially ridiculous and artistically fallacious. Most of them, we understand, have been cut away. The theatre which it is proposed to open may not even be termed "National"; it will not be the ludicrously snobbish thing that was rumored—no mere preserve of millionaires and hunting-ground of social aspirants; it will not be "endowed," at least not in the sense of being exempt from the need of following business principles in its management; and it will aim to show that the best plays and the best acting will pay. Incidentally, it will, it is hoped, do something, by the exhibition of a higher standard, to educate popular taste away from the depressing forms of recreation which too many of our theatres offer with popular toleration, if not approval. With all these ends now avowed by the projectors of the new theatre, every believer in the educative function of the drama must sympathize.

The action of the Harvard faculty in recommending the abolition during 1906 of intercollegiate football as now played, and until such time as a proper game is substituted for it, should seal the fate of this sport in many other quarters. At Cambridge the Faculty, Overseers, and President Eliot now being opposed to its continuance, it remains for the Corporation also to fall into line—so many governing bodies has our oldest university. That the Athletic Committee will stand out against this decision of the powers is not likely, particularly as the prohibition relates only to intercollegiate contests. It is, moreover, not probable that the kind of game the Harvard Faculty wants can be evolved within a year unless Rugby football is adopted outright. Certainly, such modifications as have been suggested by the new Rules Committee are not sufficiently radical, and from present appearances even those colleges which stick to the game are apparently going to disagree over regulations. The possibility of one kind of football in the East and another in the West is clearly in sight.

The agreement between Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to exclude freshmen and graduate students from all 'varsity teams, is another step in the right direction, since it will put an end to some of the recruiting done in the preparatory schools and in other colleges. Yet efforts will be continued to lure schoolboys to this or that institution, to be trained for a season on second or scrub elevens before joining the 'varsity teams in their sophomore year. And this change will not, of course, end the bad features of the athletic obsession. The evils of gate money, of notoriety, of the public-entertainment idea, the hysterical enthusiasm which leads to many afternoons wasted on bleachers and to the ridiculous organized cheering and singing, are still to be grappled with, to say nothing of the worse than prize-ring spirit and method on the field which President Eliot has characterized so properly.

The Algeciras conference is still working at the problem of policing Morocco. It is a task that France is preëminently well-fitted to undertake. Yet to concede this exclusive right to France would be to withdraw pretty much all the political pretensions of Germany in the premises. There is talk of a compromise—a native police officered by some small neutral Power. But this solution would be worthless unless some strong Power stood behind the European officers. Germany will naturally use all the resources of diplomacy to see that this strong Power is not France. The weakness of Germany's opposition lies in the fact that she has no reasonable excuse for offering her own services, and probably no attractive alternative to French control. When the matter comes to a vote, there can be little doubt that the decision will be for France, with such stipulations as may save the pride of Germany. As for rumors that Germany will "veto" such a decision or withdraw from the conference, we are unwilling to credit anything of the sort. It is doubtful if a right of veto exists; it is certain that to move heaven and earth to get a conference and then decline to abide by its findings would leave the Wilhelmstrasse in a position both isolated and ridiculous. So far as Germany has tangible interests to conserve, the conference will give her satisfaction. On other matters she can well afford to accept gracefully from an international court conditions that she declined to consider on the authority of England and France alone.

No sooner had Chamberlain's schemes been defeated in the English election than they began to be repudiated in Canada. Mr. Fisher, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, made a speech in Montreal recently, in which he roundly declared that his Government had no wish whatever to enter into a preferential trade agreement with England. Canadian farmers, he contended, did not ask any preference. They were able to hold their own on equal terms anywhere; and so long as the British market was free to them, they did not "ask the British people to burden themselves for the benefit of either Canadians or any other part of the Empire." On the whole, the Minister asserted, he was glad and Canada was glad, that the result of the general election in England was to make an end of the plan of preferential trade within the Empire. So this is what is left of that "offer" of Canada which Mr. Chamberlain affirmed it would be little short of treason for England to refuse.

Mr. Chamberlain has persuaded Mr. Balfour to call a meeting of the Unionist party. Presumably the purpose of such an assembly would be to unify the policy of his Majesty's Opposition, and, in all likelihood, the vote of such a caucus would be given for Chamberlainism in some measure. Mr. Chamberlain undoubtedly controls all that is still afloat of the Unionist flotsam. He hopes, through an impersonal party vote, to give Mr. Balfour that push towards protection which it would be ungracious to administer personally. The chances are that the leader of the Opposition will have to choose between conformity to the Chamberlain programme and self-effacement. Meanwhile, Mr. Chamberlain appears as a champion of Mr. Balfour's very novel doctrine that party disunion is on the whole a good thing. With a dwindling majority, Mr. Balfour was constantly cheerful about permissible differences of opinion; and now Mr. Chamberlain advocates a similar cleavage as the best way of heartening a pitiful minority. He accepts Mr. Balfour's leadership, but urges upon him some comforting assurance as to Imperial reciprocity, and finally declares his intention of handling the protectionist members as an independent Parliamentary group, though in general allied with the Unionist Opposition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW NOT TO LEGISLATE.

On the eve of the passage of the Hepburn bill in the House, practically without opposition, Mr. Hepburn admitted that he did not know what it meant. Here is a bill 26 pages long, filled with minutely intricate provisions dealing with the administration of a property billions in value, and affecting all the people of the country. In the course of debate on the measure many sharp questions as to the intent and effect of the language used have been raised. Yet at the end the very author of the bill jauntily waved aside all mere details of "construction." As to the meaning of the words employed, Mr. Hepburn declared, it was "utterly futile" to think of getting "legislative unanimity on that point." "Not a member of the House," he asserted, "could write a twenty-word sentence that would not be capable of two constructions." Well, we should at least hope that any member of the House could state unmistakably that this is not the way to legislate. To stuff a bill with uncertainties and ambiguities and then to refuse even verbal amendments, and hold it up as the utmost reach of the wisdom of the House of Representatives, is a mere travesty of law-making. It makes the House assume towards the Hepburn bill very much the attitude of the old Scotch lady when asked if she knew what the Solemn League and Covenant really was. She replied: "I do not, but I'll mainteen 't." That may be magnificent theology, but it is horrible legislation.

One important matter left absolutely in a cloud by the Hepburn bill is the control of differential rates. This is a subject of vital interest. It involves the whole question of the long haul versus the short haul, and also that of discrimination against localities. In the latter particular, complaints have been long and loud in many parts of the West. It has been alleged, and with a great array of evidence, that railroad managers have selfishly used discriminating rates to build up one town, or develop one region, at the expense of another. A cure for this unfairness was explicitly sought by the Western advocates of railway legislation; but how is the case left by the Hepburn bill? Nobody knows. The point was closely argued on January 30 by Representative Littlefield in his questioning of Representative Townsend, one of the sponsors of the bill. Did it give the Commission power to abolish preferential rates? Mr. Townsend was sorry to say he thought not. He said: "The best authority I can obtain says not." "Others," he magnanimously added, "may understand that the bill confers such a power." Mr. Littlefield cited one member of the Commission who thought it did. He also argued that the power was conferred indirectly under section 3 of the existing interstate-commerce law, of which the Hepburn bill is formally amendatory. But there was no agreement. One member pointed out a glaring disagreement between one clause of the bill and a paragraph of the accompanying report; but trifles like that were not allowed to impede the march to enactment of a bill which its very begetters do not profess to understand.

Many other vexed questions are left undecided. The bill ostensibly includes "cars . . . irrespective of ownership or of any contract." and "all services in connection with the receipt, delivery, . . . and handling of property transported," yet it is denied by some, though stoutly maintained by others, that this brings express companies within the purview of the Commission. Perhaps the gravest doubt of all relates to the right of judicial review. The terms in which this is recited are vague, and their scope highly uncertain. Yet every attempt to make them more precise was voted down. Mr. Townsend made a pronouncement which may well be cited as typical of the confusion of ideas, as regards this aspect of the matter, which seems to reign in the House: "I bow always in proper submission to the decrees of the Supreme Court, and when it announces a decision [as it has done in affirming jurisdiction over "unreasonably low" as well as "confiscatory" railroad rates] I yield it obedience, until at least it has had time to study public opinion sufficiently to reverse itself."

Every one understands, however, why the slovenly bill is put through the House. It is to oblige the President, who wants the matter hurried before the Senate. Any old bill is good enough for the House. The real work of legislation is done in the Senate; so push the thing along and get it over with as soon as possible. If there are clauses drawn with studied ambiguity, trust "them above" to straighten out the tangles. And the House meekly acquiesces in its own stultification. Last year it whipped through the Esch-Townsend bill with only 17 dissenting votes; though, as Representative Sibley asserted the other day, not three members would now vote for such a measure. With similar feigned unanimity and enthusiasm, it passes the Hepburn bill in the confident expectation that it will emerge from the Senate in such shape that its own mother would not know it. Yet one occasionally hears a Representative whining about the Senate's usurpation of power, though perfectly well aware that if the House shirks the real work of framing laws, some Constitutional body must attend to it. All the powers which the House weakly lays down, it may be certain that the Senate will take up with alacrity and treat in its own fashion—and small blame to it.

A DEFENCE OF CONGRESS.

Representative Rodenberg of Illinois has anticipated the reply to those magazine and syndicate critics of Congress which Senator Lodge, or some other great "Expounder," had been expected to make. Into the "veritable vortex of vituperation" and "carnival of calumny" Mr. Rodenberg has rushed with a defence that lacks nothing of confidence. Is it true, he asks, that Congress has degenerated, that the standard of ability is lower now than in those vague "golden days"? No, he tells us. On the contrary, education is so extended that the questions confined to the consideration of statesmen of two generations ago are now discussed intelligently by "the most unpretentious citizen of the land." Mr. Rodenberg himself has found employees of the steel mills of his district "who possess the most expert and thorough knowledge of the perplexing intricacies of tariff schedules"; and it was an unassuming Illinois farmer who convinced the Representative from the Twenty-first Illinois District that the Panama route was preferable to the Nicaragua. Not Bunau-Varilla, nor the seventy jarring experts at Washington and Colon, had been able to do so much.

What is the measure of a statesman to-day who hopes to "win an enduring place in the esteem of his contemporaries"? Mr. Rodenberg answers: "He must, indeed, possess exceptional ability. . . . He is expected to display a genius that is marvellous, a versatility that is mystifying, and a resourcefulness that is more than masterful. . . . Names that stand out in bold relief on the pages of our political history as the bright intellectual stars of the past, would not rise above the level of mediocrity in this enlightened and educated age." Still, Blaine thought that the Thirty-seventh Congress contained some first-rate talent, and pointed to Fessenden, Sumner, Chandler, Wade, Trumbull, and John Sherman in the Senate, and to Galusha Grow, F. P. Blair, Thaddeus Stevens, Reuben E. Fenton, Schuyler Colfax, and a score of others in the House to illustrate his point. He also thought that the statesmen of 1861 had some serious problems to consider; but, as Mr. Rodenberg reminds us, "the world has advanced, and our ideals and standards of statesmanship have kept pace with this advancement." Sumner and Chase and Stevens might have been great statesmen if they had only been spurred on by constituencies of steel-workers who knew all the ins and outs of the Dingley tariff, or of farmers who were able to decide where engineers disagree.

But what about the personal and official integrity of the members of Congress? Are these really evil days we have fallen upon? The gentleman from Illinois thinks not. Here he is most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eloquent in denouncing the writers for the sensational magazines who picture the corruption of the Senate, the influence of corporations at Washington, with the myriad forms of graft. In these days, if a single member of Congress "prostitutes his high office for personal gain, immediately the sensational press of the country inveighs against the entire membership. The pulpit thunders. The pungent paragrapher proceeds to paragraph." It is another Illinois Representative, Mr. Mann of the Second District, who has just issued a statement in defence of the famous "mileage grab," when an extra session ran into a regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress. One sentence of his bears out the member from the Twenty-first District in the assertion that the morals of Congress are improving. "If I had wanted to 'graft,' I could easily have taken many times the small amount of my mileage, then voted against the payment of mileage, and declared how pure I was and how corrupt others were." Furthermore, Mr. Mann did not vote to pay the mileage because he himself needed or desired the money; he sank his own feeling of repugnance to the plan in order to put others in funds. Thus does grabbing become altruistic.

If Senator Lodge follows Mr. Rodenberg to the end of his argument, he will have his work cut out for him. The Illinois Congressman says that not only has the intellectual standard of our national lawmaking body been raised and its official probity heightened, "but there has also been a corresponding improvement in the personal morals of the members, and in their conception of the true relationship existing between the Government as a whole and themselves." Does even a magazine writer believe that in the days of the Crédit-Mobilier a United States Senator would have been forced to give up his seat by a public opinion that disapproved of his renting, at a fair price, a building to the Government for post-office purposes? Mr. Rodenberg pauses for a reply, and when no one ventures to give one, triumphantly declares that "an incident of this kind at that time would not even have been dignified by an official investigation."

Doubtless Mr. Rodenberg is as well qualified as the next man to discuss the improvement in the moral tone of our national legislators. As a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress, in February, 1900, he voted to strike out the appropriation for the Civil Service Commission; in March, 1901, having failed of re-election, he was made a civil-service commissioner by President McKinley. The reason given was that all the St. Louis Fair commissionerships had been filled, and the President felt obliged to take care of one of Senator Cullom's protégés. At that time the *Evening Post's* Washington correspondent reported that the only regret expressed by Mr. Rodenberg at the change of office was that the civil-service position paid only $3,500 a year, while a Fair commissionership netted $5,000. He held the post a year, then went back to Congress. Evidently, his five years of reflection have not been wasted. His present brief for his fellow-lawmakers at Washington is filled with a zealot's enthusiasm for right—in the abstract.

NEW FIELDS FOR FEDERAL POWER.

"Before many years," said in effect a conservative member of Congress the other day, "there will not be left a department of human life over which the national Government does not somehow exercise control." Great as have been the extensions of Federal functions within a comparatively few years past, there are enough others in contemplation to draw from their graves the statesmen who were arguing against internal improvements three-quarters of a century ago. In the President's last annual message there were no less than eight specific recommendations involving the exercise of new functions, or the assumption of new tasks, by the Federal Government. And if a list were compiled of the suggestions made along the same line by bills now before Congress or resolutions of public bodies—leaving out "freak" bills and constitutional amendments—it would probably be twice as long.

Railroad rate-making happens to be the most conspicuous proposal just at present. This is one of the things the National Government is asked to do because, unless it undertakes the task, it will not be performed at all. The States could not secure the same results even if they all coöperated to the full. The same may be said, of course, regarding the proposed regulation of express companies and national supervision of insurance. Other measures, widely differing in subject-matter, fall into the same general class, because they propose that the Government shall do something not done by anybody at present, or at least not done efficiently. Such, for instance, are the protection of Niagara Falls—in which the Federal power over boundaries may be invoked—the preservation of the Great Lake fisheries by international agreement, and Commissioner Sargent's much-discussed scheme for deflecting the stream of immigrants to those sections of the country where they are wanted.

Next may be classed the proposals which are urged on the ground that the Federal Government should step in merely to give the several States a chance to regulate their own affairs. These, for the most part, grow out of changed conditions. Centres of production and consumption have come to be so far apart, transportation so easy, and travelling so incessant, that local regulations, once amply sufficient, have proved, in many lines, to be little better than farcical. The Pure Food bill owes much of its backing to the fact that a State with good food laws is now at the mercy of one with bad laws or none, which can flood it with impure products; the prohibition communities never cease asking for Congressional action that will undo the "original package" decisions and help the State authorities to stop liquor in transit the moment it crosses the line. Other bills favored by the same interests wish a law that will make the records of the internal-revenue office more useful in the prosecution of illicit liquor sellers. The national quarantine law, which, as always after the threat of an epidemic, is being strongly urged this year, would similarly save the neighboring States from the consequences of the laxity of any one. And President Roosevelt's recommendation that the criminal process of each State be made to run throughout the entire country, bears somewhat the same relation to moral health.

Finally should be mentioned those instances in which national action is urged chiefly to secure uniformity of system in some department. The practical restriction of naturalization to the Federal courts, as recommended recently by a commission, is one example, and another the partly completed extension of national trade-mark legislation; while the national child-labor law, strongly pushed by a State labor commissioner recently, though without citation of the constitutional provision which would authorize it, is a type of many benevolent measures so advocated. Though several of these have been actively opposed and some kept from passage for many years, the argument, on abstract principles, of danger from the assumption of additional functions by the Federal Government is almost never heard. In fact, it is remarkable how much support such measures have in the old region of jealous States'-rights sentiment. The national quarantine is distinctively a Southern measure, the liquor shipment bills are most strongly advocated there; and as for pure food, two Southern States are the only ones which, by a provision of their State law, have made the food standards of the Secretary of Agriculture go into effect within their borders as fast as promulgated. So a number of Southern as well as Northern States have voluntarily turned over their quarantine stations to the Public Health and Marine Hospital service.

Efficiency has come to be the controlling argument in most of these cases. Our National Government has a way of getting things done—not economically, perhaps, but effectively—that the States

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simply stand by and envy. The illicit liquor-seller, who defies the sheriff and the chief of police, would not dare to run for a week without paying his Federal tax. The Federal officer, in any line of work, is freer from hampering local influences and is apt to be backed up more firmly in doing his duty. The present advocacy of Federal control as a general panacea is really not so much an indication of changing Constitutional views, as a tribute to the relatively effective way in which power is applied from Washington.

TRUST COMPANIES AND BANKS.

There are many peculiar and unusual aspects of the controversy which came again to a head at last week's legislative hearing at Albany over compulsory cash reserves of trust companies. The New York Associated Banks, three years ago, peremptorily demanded that, if the trust companies wished to retain the right of exchanging checks through members of the clearing-house of banks, they must, at stipulated intervals, increase their ratio of cash reserves to deposit liabilities until it stood at 10 per cent. The trust companies answered that, while they might have considered such a proposition in an equal conference, they would accept no dictation from the banks; and most of them promptly withdrew from clearing-house connections, asserting that the banks were jealous of the competitive achievements of the trust companies, and were striving to clip their wings. To this the banks retorted that the assertion was true in so far as the trust companies did a banking business pure and simple without the restrictions imposed upon the banks. Such a condition, some of the spokesmen for the banks alleged, was distinctly unfair, not to mention possible dangers involved by such exemptions for the future of trust company finance. So this curious game of recrimination has gone on. Trust companies declared that their own deposits in bank, which were very large and on which the banks pay 2 per cent. interest, were a sufficient guarantee of safety without a cash reserve. Banks replied that they themselves kept only 25 per cent. cash against such deposits, and that, even supposing the trust company fund in bank to be 25 per cent. of the corresponding deposit liabilities, there would still be held, to protect those liabilities, not 25 per cent., but only a trifle over 6 per cent. Trust companies rejoined to this, Why not increase your own reserve, then? Banks retorted, We cannot afford to do it; the burden should fall on you. And so an interminable controversy—a prolonged argument in a circle, always ending where it began—has pursued its course.

We have felt from the first that the party whose interests, really paramount, have not been sufficiently considered, is the general public. Believing this, we have thought that the proper solution of the matter lay in legislative action regarding trust-company reserves. The whole discussion has been so clouded, hitherto, by the constant insisting on non-essentials that sight has been lost of the fact that, under the present law, trust companies in New York State need not keep a dollar of reserve, either in their own vaults or in their depository banks. If it so choose, one of these companies may invest every dollar of its depositors' money and all of its capital and surplus in securities or time loans.

The right to do this was conferred on the trust companies when their exclusive functions were conceived to be, in the language of the law, "to act as fiscal or transfer agent," "to act as trustee under any mortage or bond," "to act as guardian, receiver, or trustee," and "to take, accept, and execute any and all such trusts and powers" as might be conferred upon them. So long as the strict intent of the law of 1887 was carried out, it may readily be conceded that no cash reserve beyond a trifling "working balance" was required. Every one knows, however, that the trust companies as a whole have departed very far from this simple conception of their powers and duties. Unquestionably, there are companies which to-day hold as strictly to the function of administrator and trustee as they did a dozen years ago. But such institutions are now few in number. Many of our trust companies are in reality nothing but deposit banks, doing their business free from the restrictions imposed by the deposit banking law. Most of them do both kinds of business; but with these the part of the business made up of pure deposit banking has increased in a vastly greater ratio than the simple trust department. In January, 1898, the reports showed $185,099,694 "deposits in trust" against $198,229,029 "general deposits"; that is to say, the two kinds of business nearly balanced. In January, 1905, "deposits in trust" were $275,665,112, whereas "general deposits" had risen to $695,031,064. The form of report was somewhat changed last year; but analysis of the returns of November 9, 1905 (made when a call for reports was not expected, and when the showing was therefore more trustworthy), indicated something like $900,000,000 deposits precisely on the footing of deposits in the banks, $816,529,425 being, in fact, described as "deposits subject to check."

Against this $900,000,000, the companies then held 2⅜ per cent. in cash on hand, and 12¼ per cent. in cash on deposit in other institutions. Let it be observed that this ratio applies only to deposits not of the trustee or "time deposit" order. If all the deposit liabilities reported November 9 were to be included, the ratio of cash on hand would be slightly under 2 per cent., and of cash on deposit 9⅞ per cent. But, even as to this, it is important to observe, there is no compulsion; and, in fact, it is well known that the average ratio is raised by the strong position maintained by a few large and conservative companies. Very nearly half of the cash held by all the eighty-one trust companies in this State, as shown by the Banking Department's last report, was in the hands of six institutions.

The question, in our judgment, clearly is, not whether there shall be a reserve required from these institutions, but what that reserve shall be. The terms submitted at last week's hearing by Mr. Borne as satisfactory to the trust companies were 3 per cent. in cash, 6 per cent. in investments, and 6 per cent. in deposits in other institutions. This strikes us as both inadequate and unscientific—certainly so in the case of the numerous trust companies which do a simple deposit banking business. The proposed law, on the other hand—a 15 per cent. reserve for large city institutions and 10 per cent. in smaller localities, half in cash and half in deposits with other banks—appears to us extremely moderate, save, perhaps, in the single case of companies acting purely as trustees and conducting no simple deposit banking business. The plainest solution would be separation of what in reality are the two distinct branches of the trust company accounts, exemption of the one from reserve requirements, and imposition on the other of a reserve ratio at least as high as the pending bill requires, and preferably higher.

NOTES ON EDUCATION IN MEXICO.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
January, 1906.

Having just returned from a visit to the great Republic to the south of us, I venture to write down certain observations made under conditions which were in some respects exceptional. It is singular that we as a people are so ill-informed regarding Mexico—I speak as one who until now would have owned up to the charge—and that so great a nation has grown up at our doors without attracting more attention. It is true that the capitalists, promoters, mining-boomers, and people generally who have irons to heat in the fire, have discovered Mexico; but, apart from the interest recently stirred up in connection with pan-American politics and the Monroe Doctrine, and the meeting of the five-years-apart conferences of American Republics, little knowledge has been diffused abroad among us as to things intellectual, or in the large sense "moral," in the Republic. Indeed, the feeling creeps into one's mind as he sits down to write, that perhaps the duty of the hour now is to give further impulse not so much to the material forces at work to cement the States, as to those more conservative but intangible forces which make for common moral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort among the nations of America. It is undoubtedly true in the educational field, at any rate, that we are lamentably ignorant of the institutions of Mexico; and it is no doubt also true that this ignorance has been the cause of the lack of effort to bring about any sort of reciprocity and co-operation between that State and our own.

I went down by arrangement with Señor Justo Sierra, the new Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts of Mexico, who extended to me a hospitality most generous and unstinted; and I spent some days in touch with the Department in the City of Mexico. The time was well chosen for observation generally, and more particularly for observation of the educational institutions, for with the New Year the academic year begins, and the formal opening functions, under the direct patronage of the Minister, then take place. The academic year runs continuously from January to November, with a short Easter recess; and what we call the "long vacation" comes not in summer, but in the fall, covering the two months November and December. This is as suitable an arrangement as any other, in a country in which the climate is equable—the temperature on the great tableland being about 60 to 70 degrees Fahrenheit all the year round. It must be remembered that Mexico is, apart from the narrow strip of sea-level on both coasts, a great plateau varying from six to ten thousand feet above the sea, and that one has while staying there the same climate that so many of us have been going to the Engadine to secure. The schools, then, may remain open all through the summer, and all through the year, in a latitude usually associated by us with torrid heat, malarial fever, and insects galore; for none of these things are present.

Another general educational fact that becomes more apparent the farther one indulges his curiosity, is the sharp distinction, in all matters of more than purely local interest, between the affairs of the several confederated States and those of the Federal District of Mexico. Politically, the distinction is the same as with us. Our District of Columbia corresponds to the Federal District of Mexico. But in the latter country the Federal District is, as it is not with us, in many respects the *essentia et substantia* of the Republic. In matters of civilization and culture, of education and art, of literature and what would be called broadly the "affairs" of the country, the Federal District is Mexico, and Mexico is the City of Mexico. In matters of public education, for example, the two interests are in most strongly marked contrast. The States, of which there are twenty-seven, differ as much in their laws as do ours, but, more than that, the States on the one side and the Nation on the other have essentially different problems on their hands. In Mexico City there is a large cultivated and graded population, showing all the forms of cosmopolitanism that one would expect in a city having its history. There are traditions of Spanish as well as of later Mexican origin that give literary and artistic flavor to the life of the metropolis. In the matter of architecture alone a single significant fact, pertinent to my present point, is this—that the higher institutions, the School of Music, the School of Fine Arts, the Preparatorium (the institution giving the highest "arts" course), and many other similar establishments are now housed in the fine old Spanish structures which exemplify the splendid art of the Spanish Renaissance. There is background and atmosphere to the life in Mexico City which not only is absent, but will perforce continue to be absent for years to come, in the great State areas of rural Mexico. In the States, the population is more largely Indian—the North American, pure and undilute, though indeed less "undilute," as appears from statistics, than is generally supposed. Yet the problem of education, outside the Federal District, is that of furnishing a good and free common-school education to the Indian boys and girls whose parents live in adobe huts and serve the great haciendado or ruler of the plantation. The owner of the hacienda has often the entire responsibility of providing schools in his territory.

The result is that, in the States, one finds primary education about all that is to be looked for—with important exceptions, of course. President Diaz himself, in a long and animated conversation it was my privilege to have with him, said that the great educational problem confronting his country was the training of the millions of Indian children. It is in the Federal District, therefore, and of necessity, that the impulses of the higher training first make themselves felt; and they are already of great strength and promise. The present Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts dates only from last year, when the Department of Justice, formerly joined to it, was separated off, and the Minister of Public Instruction now in office, the Hon. Justo Sierra, was appointed to his present position. This step itself is recognized by the President as one of his important moves, and in this I think competent opinion would agree with him. Señor Sierra is a man of fine presence, large in every sense, genial and popular, and at the same time, being himself a teacher by training and by right of success, fitted to deal with the questions proper to the bureau. It is under his direction that the Government has recently issued the superb work, 'Mexico, Its Social Evolution,' in three large quarto illustrated volumes, with which certain of our libraries and public men have been favored. In this work, indeed, the treatise on Education, written by Señor Chavez (now Sub-Secretary), will be found of great interest.* Señor Sierra is also known as one of the legislators to whom the country owes the compulsory-education law of 1888.

Señor Sierra is seconded in his work by others who hardly yield to the chief in zeal and information. I may take pardonable professional pride in calling attention to the fact that the Sub-Secretary, Sr. E. A. Chavez, is by common consent the leading psychologist of Mexico. He was professor of psychology in the Preparatorium before his appointment to his present position; and he has done important service in rendering into Spanish certain of the classics of logic and ethics—notably the 'Logic' of Mill and the 'Ethics' of Spencer. It is of especial interest to us that his latest translation is of the 'Primer of Psychology' of our honored psychologist, Professor Titchener of Cornell—a book whose physical size is much enlarged in the process.* Señor Chavez, whose interests and competence are shared by an able staff—among them Sr. J. J. Tablada, one of the best-known contemporary poets of Spanish America—is a man of large views and positive measures. Under his direction—and with the sympathy and endorsement of Señor Sierra—we may expect the details both of reform and of new organization to be informed with good psychology and adjusted with practical judgment.

As to the institutions themselves, much has been already done. The normal-school problem was attacked a half-generation ago by a wise minister, Baranda, and by a man whose name remains in Mexico a great educational force, Enrique C. Rébsamen, son of a Swiss father. At the time of the latter's death, two years ago, the Normal Schools, one for each sex, were already great and influential. Many of the coming men in education in the metropolis confess that their interest and competence are due to the inspiration of this great teacher. His mantle seems, indeed, to have fallen on other shoulders. The primary and secondary (called in Mexico "superior primary") instruction of the District is in the hands of Señor M. F. Martinez, who is at present in the midst of a series of wide and generous projects. He is building nine schoolhouses, which, to judge from the two just completed, are to be models of what convenient, hygienic, and "fit" school-buildings should be. He is also interested in forwarding the manual-training movement, in which good beginnings have been made. His son is in charge of the manual courses in the Normal Schools, bringing to the task the results of two years spent in New York; and manual training has already been introduced in the country schools. A quite proper distinction is made—that is, proper in the present writer's opinion—between the modes of manual work appropriate to boys and girls respectively. I was shown the work of the village of Xochimilco, lying in a rural environment, where seven schools are conducted under Sr. Martinez' administration. It is a typical Indian village, in the midst of the tangle of canals that are called the Viga, near Mexico, and comprises the well-known chinampas, or floating gardens, where much of the garden produce is raised for the metropolis. The work of the girls in the schools of different grades was exhibited, and a collection presented to me to bring away. It is extremely good—drawn linen, silk embroidery, and other products of the needle that only a woman could properly describe, all of which would do credit to the skill of professional needlewomen and lace makers. The work exhibited in Mexico City from the boys' schools shows good beginnings, but is still in its infancy compared with the finished output of our own great manual-training schools. Sr. Martinez, it may be added, was formerly identified with the school system of the growing town of Monterey, which is becoming the centre of American influence in the Republic.†

The higher institutions seem to have been formed after models more of the

*The same may be said, indeed, of the other chapters of this important work, dealing with all the great aspects of the Mexico of to-day, and written by leading native authorities. 'Sr. Sierra was himself the "literary editor."'

*It seems that we all acquire increased outward importance in the translation process. A Spanish version of a little text-book of mine, the 'Elements of Psychology,' of which I was first informed while in Mexico, has become, from a small pocket volume, a great tome two inches thick!

†He is also author of a valuable 'History of Elementary Instruction in New Spain.'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French than of any other national type. It is, indeed, to be remarked that in many ways French civilization is more really alive in Mexico than any other, save, of course, that which survives the Spanish occupation. The effect of this *rapport* shows itself in the ability to use the French—in text-books, sources, etc.—and also in the actual organization of the schools. No doubt much is due to the direct influence of Barreda, a student and disciple of Comte, who headed the Commission of 1867 for the reorganization of the Preparatory School.

There have, indeed, grown up, somewhat as in Paris, great schools vitally issuing from some actually present cultural root, so to express the matter. The School of Fine Arts is connected with the art collections and with actual architectural projects; there is to be a school of Archæology, Anthropology, and History, built upon the existing Museum of Mexican Antiquities; the School of Commerce is a practical vehicle of actual commercial instruction for both sexes, and so on. This is somewhat the origin also of the schools of Paris, whose thorough amalgamation into a university would bring them into more organic relation to one another. In Mexico, the advantages of this have been, of course, those of an immediate, pragmatic sort: relative utility, relative lack of waste, relative directness in ministering to the demands of the national life. But the defects have also been felt, such as are apparent in other countries, viz., lack of solidarity, lack of *esprit de corps* and "team-work," and, above all, lack of some of the institutions necessary to fill out the scheme of culture. There has been wanting anything corresponding to the École des Hautes Études, or to our university faculties of philosophy, pure science, and what we denominate liberal arts of university grade. The nearest approach to our Arts course has been the curriculum of the Preparatorium, an institution corresponding fairly well to the American College, which fits its graduates to enter directly the schools of Law, Medicine, Engineering, etc. This, of course, has left great gaps in the system which only those actuated by motives of a more theoretical and directly cultural sort would care or endeavor to fill. There have been important contributions to science coming from Mexico; one recalls that the Hodgkins prize awarded by the Smithsonian Institution in 1895 went to the important study of Life in High Altitudes by the well-known teachers respectively of biology and physiology in the Normal and Medical Schools, Srs. Herrara and Vergara Lope. But as Sr. Chavez himself remarked to me, in our discussion of the subject, such work has been the result of direct individual endeavor. Literature and science alike have not had the aid or support that would come through institutions in which their pursuit is made more dignified from being official and collective.

The new National University project is, however, taking form. It has just been made the subject of an official announcement. On January 8, the day of the annual formal opening of the Preparatorium, the writer had the pleasure of attending this function with the Minister of Public Instruction. In the address which was asked for he made somewhat the same reflection as that written out above, and said that the great further need was that of a National University, a school devoted to Science, Literature, Philosophy, and Art for their own sakes, a school of research and production. This would bring unity and wholeness to the educational body. This was followed by the remarks of Minister Sierra, who at once rose to his feet and said that the Government was prepared then and there to announce the intention of establishing such an institution, which should constitute, with the schools already in existence, the National University of Mexico. This project was to be, he said, together with the establishment of the great National Theatre already taking form in a suitable building, the contribution of his Department of the Government to the Centennial Celebration of Mexican Independence to take place in the year 1910.

This announcement was received, it may well be imagined, with great applause, and the newspapers the following day commented upon it as one of the most important measures which modern Mexico owed to the Administration of President Diaz. In another address, delivered at the opening of the Normal School, I could not refrain from pointing out that the United States had neither a National University nor a National Theatre, and that in these things Mexico, coming first, was entitled to be called the leader in the development of one set of the group of interests we are coming to call Pan-American.

There are now in operation schools of Agriculture, Law, Medicine, Commerce, Fine Arts, Engineering, Music, Teaching (the two Normal Schools), Arts (in our college sense), and there will be established in the new university in addition departments for Pure Science, Philosophy, Literature, Archæology and History, Arts and Crafts, and Political and Social Science.

When one thinks of certain facts of history—the closing of the old University of Mexico, a Jesuit institution that flourished during the Spanish occupation; the conditions of confusion and paralysis that extended down late in the century, before stable government came to modern Mexico after the term of the French Intervention; the economic and racial problems with which the country has had to deal, as illustrated by the reform in finance,* only just now being brought about by that genius, a Frenchman, Limantour, the present Minister of Finance, together with the restricted scope and place, the Federal District, in which alone the problems of higher education are even yet of any pressing urgency—when one thinks of all this, it becomes evident that in such steps as these the Government of Diaz is proving itself to have extraordinary vitality and moral power. Commenting upon the proposed University, the President, in the interview referred to, declared that Minister Sierra should have all the money he needed to carry the project through. This may be commented by the remark that in his annual report, issued about the same time, Minister Limantour reported a credit balance in the national treasury, and submitted an increased estimate of receipts for the ensuing year.

So much for the spirit of the new Mexican educational life. In a report which I have promised to write out for the Bureau of Education at Washington, more detail will be appropriate. It will, however, no doubt be evident what lesson we should draw from such a movement on our southern border. We have taken interest, sometimes a servile and very imitative interest, in institutions across the sea; we have recently heard much of international co-operation and alliance in our educational operations, motived by interest in a larger fraternity and moral community: why should not this interest find an outlet here in Mexico, where a virile national life is assimilating its material from every source? In the matter of language alone, the opportunity is as great as the need: we need Spanish, they need English.* Mexicans, both teachers and students, might attend our universities in the fall term, which coincides with their long vacation.

I find that men going from us—either professors or students—would not only be welcomed, but acclaimed and honored. Things Pan-American are in the air, conferences are arranged to conserve commercial and political interests; why not such things in education, science, art? I found the Department of Public Instruction cordially open to such suggestions. It is likely that an official delegation will go from Mexico to the National Educational Association at San Francisco in July next, also visiting the summer school of the University of California.† It would be a capital thing should the American Association for the Advancement of Science hold a winter meeting in the City of Mexico; witness the procedure of the British Association in going not only to Canada twice, but this very year to South Africa! Certainly the members of the American Association would have "the time of their lives," and the international good to result would go far to leaven many of the lumps of misunderstanding over which the politicians are living the strenuous life. Indeed, there are many ways in which this lesson might just now be very practically read, and in these ways we men who work in science and literature and the arts may second the endeavors of those who are striving to bring in the day of a more united American continent.

J. Mark Baldwin.

*It happened during my visit that the Government officials were paid for the first time part (80 per cent.) of their salaries in the new gold coin—a beautiful piece of five Mexican dollars bearing the eagle and snake of the national emblem on one side, and on the reverse the head of the patriot of the Revolution, Hidalgo.

*Señor Javier Arrangoiz, Director-General of Customs, who is also Director of the School of Commerce, hopes, with the aid of Mr. H. N. Branch, Professor of English in the School, to establish a system of correspondence between pupils in Mexico and the United States. I should be glad to serve as medium of communication for any teachers who wish to join in such a scheme.

†Since writing this I have heard from Prof. E. C. Moore, Dean of the Summer School, who happened to be in Mexico when I was, that Sr. Chavez has been asked to lecture at Berkeley this coming summer. Lic. Orci, also an official in the Department, is coming this spring to the Johns Hopkins for advanced work in psychology.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF SCULPTORS, PAINTERS, AND GRAVERS.

London, January 8, 1906.

The International has already, in its six years, accomplished an important work. It has introduced into London the art of the world which was hardly known there before. It has carried into the English provincial cities exhibitions such as had never

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hitherto been seen in them. It has become—instead of the Royal Academy, the so-called national artistic body, but really the tomb of national art—the association of the artists of the country, to which foreign Governments come when they wish to organize British sections in international exhibitions abroad. If the shows which it held in America were not altogether what was expected of them, that was wholly the fault of some of the artists, who were not intelligent enough to take advantage of their opportunities. Nor has the International been content to introduce good art into England; it has tried no less for good arrangement, both in the placing of the work exhibited and the decoration of the galleries. And last, but not least, the most important thing of all, the International has vindicated the name and reputation of Whistler, its first president, and given him the position he had been denied all his life.

This Society has just opened in the New Gallery its sixth exhibition, which in main respects differs but little from its five others. One striking innovation, however, has been made. The "Gravers"—the word is Whistler's—do not appear now at all, but their section, which has so far been the most successful of the three, and includes water-colors and pastels as well as prints and drawings, is reserved for a separate show, to open toward the end of this month. In the absence of the Gravers, there is no question that the sculptors monopolize the interest. Once more, the central court has been converted into a stately white temple, Rodin's "Baiser" taking the place of his "Penseur" of two winters ago. "Le Baiser" is well known; the surprise is to see it in a London gallery. It need hardly be described, so often already has its beauty of form and design been pointed out. Rodin has never done anything more perfect than these two figures, so superbly and sympathetically modelled, the contrast between the muscular strength of the man and the delicate grace of the woman so learnedly suggested, such charm and passion in the pose, such rhythm and stateliness in the outline, where Rodin of late deliberately fails. It represents him at his finest and sanest, before he launched into the experiments and eccentricities and mistakes which, unfortunately, his admirers and disciples have praised until the public—the sheep following whithersoever they may be led—have come to believe that in these lie the measure and fulness of his genius. The "Baiser" makes it the harder to understand his reason for the awkwardness, the formless silhouette, of a work like the "Paolo and Francesca," occupying a centre in another room. In this the figures emerge, in the now familiar fashion, from a great shapeless rock, but, in emerging, they have not the grace and loveliness of some of his other little groups of the same kind. They lie clasped in an almost clumsy embrace, their outstretched arms repeating an ugly line and gesture. Whatever meaning there may be is lost in the chaotic arrangement.

After M. Rodin, the late Constantin Meunier, the Belgian, and Mr. Paul W. Bartlett, the American, are the two sculptors who appear with the greatest distinction. There is an unusually fine collection of Meunier's work: small bronze reliefs, statuettes and busts of the subjects that were his inspiration—the miners and laborers and peasants, in whom he saw as much beauty as the Greek sculptor saw in his gods and in the priests and youths who sacrificed to them. Meunier, still more than Millet, ennobled labor and knew how to express all that there is in it of heroism and grandeur. The heads have character; in the reliefs, men and women and beasts move in rhythmical unison; the oldest and most wrinkled and worn women of the people have a tragic dignity—the dignity of the type. And all this little collection has been so well arranged where it fills one side of the court, that never yet, not in Paris or Antwerp, not in Brussels or Liège, have I felt the force and truth and impressiveness of Meunier as now in the New Gallery. But the Belgian's reputation had reached London; not so the American's. Mr. Bartlett is a newcomer, but he has proved an immediate and, among artists, a sensational success. He has sent the series of small bronzes that won him fame and the highest honors at St. Louis—the graceful vases, the little figures as perfect as if unearthed from some old Greek tomb, the marvellous fish and lions—marvellous in their harmonious line and graceful form—the torsos so well studied, so sensitively modelled. And he reveals, in addition, so much feeling for color that his work gains a quality sculpture does not always give. I have never seen any of Mr. Bartlett's more ambitious work—more ambitious, that is, in size—that could in any way approach these small and exquisite bronzes.

M. Bartholomé has already contributed more remarkable sculpture to the International. His "Adam et Eve," a learned academical exercise, in so heroic proportion that it is quite out of scale in the court, and his other two exhibits, "Jeune Fille se Coiffant" and "Au Bord de l'Eau," seem insignificant from the sculptor of the monumental tomb to the dead at Père-la-Chaise. Mr. Wilson, who is retaining some of his work for the February exhibition, has only an excellently designed "Pietà," a relief for the private chapel at Welbeck Abbey. Mr. Furse and Mr. Wells are other of the more notable exhibitors. And there is nothing else for me to mention, unless it be that Mr. Havard Thomas, the late notoriety, sends a relief that I wonder to see hung in this small but fine collection, and that Mr. Ricketts, the universal genius, has this year descended upon sculpture.

The painting, it might as well be admitted frankly (or rather the British part of it), includes much that is distressingly commonplace and more distressingly bad. The Scotchmen, as a rule, are too poor for notice; the Glasgow School, for the moment anyway, have gone to pieces—there are only a very few exceptions. The galleries themselves are as effective as ever at a first glance. Walls draped with grayish white or pale neutral green make the best possible background, the pictures are hung fairly well, though not with the thought and care devoted to the Whistler Exhibition last year. However, there is no clumsy crowding as at the Academy, and you feel that so much attention and respect could not have been lavished upon work without genuine merit. The truth is, after the first glance, you see only too plainly that most of the work is of the smallest merit, if any. The International, with Whistler as its president, started for the avowed purpose of exhibiting all that is finest and most individual in modern art everywhere, without any foolish limit of school or nationality. In one particular it has not wavered: it is international in its selection of work as in its name. But the selecting committee of painters should have been more rigid in their standard, and their weakness is the more unpardonable because the sculpture committee have so splendidly shown them the way. It may be thought that, as the best work comes from abroad, this is proof of the breadth and liberality of the painters. But for so much poor work the foreigner is also responsible that one fears the lack of judgment has been even greater than the liberality. However, when the Academy is remembered, when the bad hanging, the insularity, the dreadful decoration of most of the London exhibitions is considered, one is the less inclined to criticise the International too severely. The trouble is that it has already done so much that the suggestion of anything like a falling away from the high aims with which it set out is at once resented.

One of the most interesting things to me in the exhibition is the attempt to obtain a representative showing of American artists. Little is known over here of what is being done by the American artist at home. The American artist in England is known well enough for the English to be eager to appropriate him, and so we have Sargent and Abbey and Shannon in the Academy, and the amazing spectacle of Whistler figuring as a painter of the British school in a National Gallery. The American artist in Paris sometimes sends to London, where he has at least been heard of. But that there are artists, and distinguished artists, quietly working in their native land, no Englishman would condescend to believe. As a strong endeavor to prove that there are has been made this year, the pity is it should not have been more thorough and more successful. The Pennsylvania Academy has contributed six or seven pictures, but only three out of these do the painters full justice. There is the very beautiful "Mother and Child," by Mr. De Forest Brush, and I am glad to see it is receiving as much attention in London as it received in Paris in 1900—the attention it deserves. The golden "Sheep Pasture," by Mr. H. W. Ranger, is distinctly one of the finest landscapes in the entire exhibition. "People at Breakfast," that well-studied and well-observed interior, by Mr. E. C. Tarbell, is most interesting, and Mr. J. De Camp's "Little Hotel," though rather commonplace, still has character. But the pictures by Theodore Robinson, Winslow Homer, and Mr. Eakins should never have been sent, nor a painting of flowers by Mr. Alden Weir, lent by a private owner. Nor has Mr. Wiles been discreet in the choice of his portraits. The American may be perfectly well aware of the distinguished and strong work these artists have done; but the Englishman is not, and he scarcely would imagine it from the performances by which they are now represented, while the absence of men like Childe Hassam, Dewing, and many others, is greatly to be regretted. It seems always the way when American work is exhibited in London. Even Mr. Chase, a member of the International

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—he has nothing this year—usually prefers to send indifferent portraits rather than his masterly renderings of still life, like his fish, for instance. And as for the New York Water Color Club, when the members held an exhibition in London last spring, they did themselves anything but good by it. However, I hear that a genuinely representative series of drawings and prints has been prepared by American artists for the International's approaching second exhibition, and I hope it will make up for the disappointment that I, anyway, have had in the pictures.

There is reason for disappointment in most of the other foreign sections. From Germany, though the National Galleries at Berlin and Cologne contribute, comes little of note, save a large, powerful landscape by Von Bartels, "The Flemish Inn," a wide stretch of wind-swept flat meadow land, and lines of wind-swept poplars under a dramatic sky. From Holland and Belgium comes hardly more: two or three not very remarkable Israels, a Bauer not so good as pictures the artist has had in previous shows, a Mesdag, and two paintings by Buysse, amazingly full of observation—one an impression of sunlight and mist on a frosty morning; the other a Flemish canal in the early hours of a September day. Italy would not count were it not for a characteristic Segantini, "Early Spring"; while, for some reason I fail to understand, those always amusing and often daring young Spaniards, Zuloaga and Anglada, have given place to their much less interesting countryman, Sorolla y Bastida. Thaulow carries off all the Scandinavian honors.

The French, however, appear more triumphantly, not solely in a group of the Impressionists, but in the contributions of the younger men influenced by them. Manet, Monet, Sisley, Pissarro, Renoir, Degas, Berthe Morisot, even Cézanne, who is just at this moment enjoying an exaggerated reputation, are all included: Manet most notably in "Le Linge," a good example of his "peinture claire"; Monet most delightfully in "Antibes," one of the earlier landscapes that are reminders of the beauty he once allowed himself to see in Nature. The Carrières are fine, "Maternité" and "Mère et Fille"; but I have spoken of them when they were exhibited in Paris. Two of the Besnards are wonderful impressions of majestic cloud storms gathering and threatening above a wide sandy beach. M. Boldini's "Mrs. E. A. Salaman" is one of his extraordinarily clever and audacious performances, and M. Aman-Jean's portrait of a lady, from the New Salon, has the usual charm. Raffaëlli, Cottet, Simon are by no means at their best. And, altogether, my interest was greatest in a nude by M. Louis Legrand, the hackneyed motive of a woman at the bath, treated with such knowledge of form, such subtlety of modelling, such a delicate sense of color, that it has all the originality of a new technical theme—a little masterpiece. Hardly less astounding are two small Vuillards, a woman at her toilet, and the corner of a room—"Chambre de Garçon"—both with that fine quality of paint that makes Vuillard the delight of artists. And with these I must place four paintings by Forain, two of dancers that suggest the influence of Degas, two of lawyers as suggestive of the influence of Daumier, but all admirable in the personal adaptation of models set by great masters.

As I have said, it is among the British members one comes upon the most hopeless commonplace. This, no doubt, is the fault of having "members." However, when the commonplace is disposed of, some good work remains. Mr. Lavery, the vice-president, is at his best in "The Ladies Evelyn and Norah Hely-Hutchinson," for the arrangement of the sisters sitting side by side is so decorative in pattern, the color is so agreeable, that it is easier to forget the unpleasantness of the technique and the utter insignificance of another of his portraits hanging opposite. Sir James Guthrie has an effective full-length of "The Marquis of Tullibardine," in khaki; but, apparently, he has hesitated between his desire to render all the detail and his deference to the methods of Whistler, with, as result, weakness throughout and an irritating restlessness. A portrait of a lady by Mr. Charles H. Shannon is more disappointing, for Mr. Shannon is an artist from whom, if one never expects strength or the knowledge of a painter like Legrand, one does look for a decorative arrangement. But the figure is placed so low on the canvas as to lose all graciousness as well as dignity of design; while the color scheme is so low in tone that only with difficulty does one make out the design at all. Better are the portraits by Mr. Nicholson, who of a sudden, however, shows an inclination to reëcho Mr. Sargent when one would so much rather see Mr. Nicholson himself. But best of all is Mr. Greiffenhagen's portrait of his wife, a graceful figure standing in graceful pose, the simple dress the excuse for a lovely harmony in black and silver, the only stronger color in the flesh tints of the flatly modelled face and the pale roses of the hat. There are admirable landscapes by Mr. Peppercorn, Mr. Mura, Mr. Oliver Hall, Mr. Bertram Priestman. And, if I add that there is also work by Mr. Strang, Mr. Pryde, Mr. Ricketts, Mr. Conder, I have said enough to give a good idea of the scope and variety of the most important annual exhibition of modern work now held in London. It will be interesting to see what the "Gravers," whose section has hitherto been the most important, will make of an exhibition all to themselves. N. N.

THE RUINS OF ANGKOR.

SAIGON, November 30, 1905.

French Indo-China is much less visited by travellers than it deserves to be. This is in part because the ordinary tourist is hardly more than aware of its existence, or, if he has any impressions about the country, they are pretty certain to be unfavorable, based on the common assertion that the French do not know how to colonize. In part, too, the neglect of these regions by the globe-trotting public is due to the fact that the means of transport are still unsatisfactory. Thus, though the boats of the Messageries Maritimes stop at Saigon, one must, in order to visit Tonking, either retrace one's steps northward for some distance, or else take at Hongkong a decrepit little steamer, whose date of sailing it is impossible to find out much beforehand. Even the service along the coast from Haiphong to Saigon, though comparatively regular, is not really good. All this is a pity, as there is plenty to see. The landscape is picturesque, for the coast is rugged and the interior mountainous or rich with tropical vegetation; the towns, too, old and new (most of them are both), are worth a visit. Haiphong is a thriving port, with rosy dreams for the future. Hanoi, since 1898 the capital of Indo-China, is in some ways perhaps the most attractive-looking spot for a residence in the Far East. It is a fresh, new city, prosperous and cheerful in appearance even though the stucco with which the buildings are covered soon becomes shabby and is often not as well kept up as it should be; but the broad streets are in perfect condition, there are good public buildings and handsome shops—indeed, it is hard to see who can support them all; the trees are numerous though still young; there is a fine botanical garden, pretty rides and drives, a theatre with a subsidized troupe (shared with Haiphong), a school of Oriental research, and other institutions of many kinds. Then, too, Hanoi has a real winter of a sort—for instance, driving on a November afternoon one may need an overcoat; so the climate is good as tropical climates go. None the less it is tropical, a fact not taken enough into account in the building of many of the houses, which are better suited to the suburbs of Paris than to Tonking. The native part of the town is quaint and bustling, though the few monuments of Annamite art in the vicinity are not striking. Altogether Hanoi makes a very favorable impression on the visitor. Whether its prosperity is factitious and due to too large an expenditure of public moneys, is a question on which the tourist should hardly venture an opinion, but there seem good grounds for being optimistic about the future of a capital situated in a fertile, thickly settled region, and the meeting-place of four railways.

Saigon is quite different from her younger rival. Though no longer the metropolis of the colony, she is the chief commercial centre, the port from which great and ever-increasing quantities of rice are shipped to many countries, including our own Philippines. The European city has an older, more established look than Hanoi. The trees are taller and more numerous, the theatre and Government buildings are finer; but, like Singapore, Saigon is hot all the year round, and, being built in the midst of a mud delta, offers no chance for an escape to a cooler neighborhood. There is a good deal of business done here, but, in spite of its trees and its theatre and its cafés, and its closer touch with the outside world, one would hardly choose Saigon as a home without some special reason. However, it repays coming to see for a day, and it is also the starting-point for an excursion to the ruins of Angkor.

Before saying anything about these wonderful remains, it may be worth while to point out that a visit to them, though entailing a little discomfort, is no longer a matter of real difficulty. There is a regular if not very good steamer which runs weekly in the season of high-water (from about November 15, to February 1) between Saigon and Sien Reap and Battambang in Siam, and the sail up and down has, in parts much charm. The ruins are just

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within the Siamese border, but one should get a pass beforehand in Pnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, from the French residency there, which telegraphs ahead how many visitors may be expected, so that there shall be enough sampans (native boats) to meet them. Pnom Penh itself is a rather attractive, bustling little place, with a puppet king and a new foreign quarter, adorned with the trees and fine roads the usual accompaniments of French rule; but its resources are soon exhausted, and one grudges the twenty-four hours spent there both going and coming. It is, however, a great convenience to those not provided with the necessary outfit, that the manager of the Grand Hotel furnishes not only food and bedding but servants and an interpreter for the further journey. In the very early morning of the following day the steamer reaches the mouth of the Sien Reap River, where one finds a sampan in waiting and is paddled up stream for five hours to the town of Sien Reap, and, after a further hour's drive by bullock-cart, reaches Angkor Wat. Here there is a very tolerable shelter in which the traveller can eat and sleep. If he is pressed for time, he can do his sight-seeing in two days, and then catch, on its return trip from Battambang, the steamer by which he came. The whole trip from Saigon and back in this case takes about eight days; but it is much better, if one can afford it, to wait over a boat, see everything more thoroughly, and visit some of the less-frequented ruins.

Like the Bôrôboedor and other ruins in Java, the monumental remains at Angkor were the work of a race who must have been much superior in civilization to the natives of the same region at the present time. The temples at Angkor Wat and the palaces, some three miles beyond, at Angkor Thom, are only a part, though the finest part, of the ruins scattered over a district recently an integral portion of Cambodia, of which Angkor was once the capital. The earliest work at Angkor Thom dates from the beginning of or perhaps from before the Christian era, while the latest at Angkor Wat is supposed to be of the eighth or even the tenth century. We can thus say that these buildings cover a period of at least a thousand years. They not only represent an enormous amount of human labor, such as can have been performed only by a dense population in this now desolate region; they also show a very highly developed artistic quality, both in conception and in execution. As they stand to-day, they are undoubtedly entitled to a foremost place among the great monuments of the world. One must therefore deeply regret that more is not done to arrest the process of their further destruction by the ever encroaching tropical vegetation which tears them asunder, and also that further excavations are not undertaken which would doubtless bring to light much that is now hidden. Still, this would be a good deal to expect just yet of the Siamese Government on its distant frontier, but the desire of the French to restore to Cambodia—*i. e.*, get into their own hands—what has until lately been the heart of her territory, is not unnatural. What we know about these ruins is, of course, almost entirely the work of French scholars, who have investigated and are still investigating these remarkable products of an extinct civilization. Much as they have found, there is still a great deal to learn.

The dominant character of the art at Angkor is admittedly Hindu. It is recorded that the Khmer, or Cambodian, state was founded by an invasion or migration from India in the fifth century before Christ. The earlier inhabitants, the Ciampas, after some struggle, were subdued or driven to the southward. The political as well as the artistic acme in the history of Cambodia seems to have been reached some fifteen centuries later, when both Siam and Annam were tributary to her. After that her decline was rapid. Her former vassals soon became her aggressive neighbors, and then her overlords, who between them reduced her territory till what was left of it peaceably accepted a French protectorate in 1864. The Indian element in the population has probably long been submerged by the conquered race, and to this may in a measure be ascribed the decline in civilization which has taken place. It is true the modern Cambodians are a fine-looking, attractive people, even if lazy and hardly fit to hold their own in the struggle for existence against Siamese and Annamites, not to say Chinese. Cambodian art, with all its richness, is less elaborate than Indian; indeed, the traveller coming from the more fantastic work of the Mongolian East is struck with its sobriety. The layman may hardly risk an opinion on any resemblances to the art of other nations, such as have been suggested, but yet, even to the casual observer, the bas-reliefs (which differ not a little from one another) suggest the work of Assyria and Egypt; and at times the almost classical pillars make one think of Greece itself. As in the case of the pyramids, we have no knowledge how the huge blocks of stone were lifted to their lofty positions.

The temple of Angkor Wat is situated in a walled rectangular park 1,030 metres long by 830 metres wide. A stone bridge leads to the western or principal entrance, which consists of a central passage and two at the extreme sides (for chariots and elephants), piercing a gallery two hundred and fifty metres long and surmounted by three towers. About four hundred metres further, at the end of a broad highway flanked by some small ruins, is the main building. It is almost square, three stories in height, pyramidal in shape, and crowned by nine towers, most of them well preserved, although the statues adorning their exterior are in a bad state of decay. As the towers are in line with one another, it is difficult to see many of them at a time from the ordinary approach. The lower story of the temple is formed by a base, on which rests, on the four sides, a great gallery whose exterior pillars let in the light on more than half a kilometre of elaborate bas-reliefs (about two metres high), with thousands of figures representing scenes from the Ramayana and other examples of Hindu life and mythology. To quote from Sir Hugh Clifford's 'Further India':

"Even more astonishing than the Titanic character of the ruins is the wealth of beautiful detail which they display. Almost every individual stone is curiously carved. Statues of immense proportions, figures of Buddha, of giants and kings, of lions, dragons, and fabulous monsters, abound. The bas-reliefs show processions of warriors mounted on birds, on horses, tigers, elephants, and on legendary animals, combats between the king of the apes and the king of the angels, boats filled with long-bearded rowers, some of them dressed in the Chinese fashion, cock-fights, women at play with their little ones, soldiers armed with bows, with javelins, sabres, and halberts, and innumerable other scenes. The men who wrought these carvings must have been possessed by a veritable passion for artistic presentment, by a love of art for its own sake such as would seem to argue a degree of intellectual refinement which has no counterpart among the peoples of the Indo-Chinese peninsula in our own day."

The interior of the enclosure is now covered with rank vegetation, out of which, on each side of the main passage, there rises on a monumental base a detached building, a perfect little gem of architecture, reached by a lofty staircase. Nine other exterior staircases lead from the first story to the second, but their object is chiefly structural. Even the one used for the actual approach is handsome rather than convenient. The second story itself is a smaller square gallery with cross connections, and, at a little lower level, four paved courtyards formerly containing fountains or statues. From the gallery we get many charming glimpses of different parts of the structure, across, above, below. The third story, reached by an even steeper staircase than the last, encloses the base of the central tower, a highly decorated sixteen-sided, tapering spire, whose summit, though it has lost the nine metres of its point, still looms fifty-six metres above the floor. From the platform there is a splendid view of the surrounding country, and we realize that this superb monument stands literally in the midst of almost impenetrable tropical jungle. The whole grand mass is of stone, and although one tower has fallen in completely and much of the exterior decoration has suffered from the ravages of time, nevertheless the temple as a whole is in a state of extraordinary preservation, for which one may well be thankful.

Unfortunately, this is far from being the case at Angkor Thom. Here we have not one building, but a number of them in an enclosure nearly four kilometres long in each direction, and entered by five great gates. The interior is a wild jungle, out of which here and there emerges the ruin of some once proud structure or crumbling wall. We are lost in astonishment at the really terrific power of the tropical vegetation. The seed in a crack becomes a tiny creeper, which expands till the force of its slow but resistless pressure splits mighty blocks of stone from one another; statues are entwined and pulled from their pedestals; trees have grown up as if by magic in what were paved courtyards, and have burst their way through thick walls. Even places cleaned up a few years ago are once more a mass of green. In its prime, Angkor Thom, with its palaces and temples and dwellings swarming with the brilliant life of an Oriental court, must have presented a gorgeous spectacle. A Chinese writer of the thirteenth century, after the decline had already begun, has left us an account of the magnificence which he witnessed, and mentions that there were stalls for two thousand elephants alone. The chief buildings must have been most imposing. Ruinous as is their present condition, enough remains to establish their former splendor. The most interesting of them to-day is the Baïon, a great structure severely beautiful in its lines with three stories of galleries,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once surmounted by fifty solid towers, each of them with the colossal head of Brahma, whose four faces looked serenely down on the world below. Many of these towers have fallen, but others still stand, and in the midst of the desolation about them give an effect of grave majesty that is indescribable. Perhaps no one thing in the Angkor Wat itself quite equals the Baïon, and how much there is beside it!

It is hard to tear one's self away from sights such as this. To study them at all satisfactorily, even in a superficial manner, demands far more than two brief days, which are all that can be granted to them by the hasty traveller. However, even the merest tourist returns from his visit to Angkor with the feeling that he has been looking on wonders which he will never forget as long as he lives.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Correspondence.

ALL-ROUND CONSTITUTION-STRAINING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your notice of my *Atlantic* article on the United States Senate, you very fairly point to the President's recent manœuvres as a straining of Constitutional barriers quite as reprehensible as any proceedings of the Senate. When all is said, a thought will arise that the House of Representatives is not far behind either Senate or President in disregard of its real rights and duties, neglecting the latter and exaggerating the former beyond all bounds. The chief object of most members is to stand well with their constituents, so as to keep their seats; they are little scrupulous as to the means of effecting this end, and allow their relations to the President and Senate to take on all sorts of undignified and illegitimate forms.

In Mr. Cleveland's second term, the Democratic House, so largely controlled by Southern members, was intent on an early repeal of the so-called "Force Bill," or Federal Election Law. This repeal was sure, and while it was deferred there was no danger that the law would be operative. The President sent, not a public message, but private suggestions, to various members to let the repeal wait till some progress had been made with the tariff. One member greeted a note of this kind with the audible remark: "I wish the President would attend to his end of the Avenue, and let us attend to ours." Yet that member regularly laid siege to the White House "end of the Avenue"; he haunted the departments at all hours, demanding offices for his constituents to which he had no more constitutional claim than to the command of the army. WILLIAM EVERETT.

QUINCY, MASS., February 12, 1906.

PIGEON-HOLING EXTRAORDINARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the alleged inefficiency of Government departments: there was received at this library on January 29, 1906, a document entitled 'A First Report on the Relations between Climates and Crops,' by Cleveland Abbe. The date of publication is 1905, the letter of transmittal to the Secretary of Agriculture is dated August 1, 1905. I expected to find in the document the results of recent investigation. My expectations were dashed as I read the second sentence of the letter of transmittal:

"This paper is not designed as an original investigation, but as a summary of the views of the best experimentalists and observers, *so far as those had been published up to 1891*. A continuation of this study, bringing the subject up to date, is contemplated, but as the publication of this first portion has been frequently requested, it seems wise not to delay."

Turning to the preface for further light, I read:

"[The chief signal officer] issued an instruction dated Feb. 25, 1891, authorizing me to prepare this work, completing it before June 30 of that year. The present report is a rapid compilation from a wide range of sources, and presents a preliminary view of the condition of our knowledge at that time, . . . I regret that the report could not have been published in 1891."

Where, then, was the manuscript in the fourteen years one month between its completion and its transmittal to the Secretary of Agriculture? Upon this mystery are we to have no light except that suggested by the regret quoted above?

A LIBRARIAN.

February 3, 1906.

MISSAL AND PAYNIMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The discussion of Keats's line has assuredly reached a stage that must be distressing to lovers of poetry. Why this needless expenditure of dialectic? To the imagination the clasped missal may be allowed to suggest holiness which the prayers of swart paynims neglect. We should be loath to disturb Madeline's blissful slumber with the creaking of our logic-engines.

LEWIS F. MOTT.

172 WEST 79TH ST., NEW YORK,
February 12, 1906.

Notes.

A new novel, by Owen Wister, 'Lady Baltimore,' is announced by Macmillan Company.

'The Fading of the Mayflower,' one hundred and fourteen stanzas in sonnet form, by Theodore Tilton, will be published March 1, by A. N. Marquis & Co., Chicago.

Dr. W. E. Griffis is at work upon a revision of his 'Mikado's Empire,' brought down to date by an account of the Russo-Japanese war. Messrs. Harper expect to have it in hand by mid-summer.

G. P. Putnam's Sons will soon publish the fourth and concluding volume of Dr. Morgan Dix's 'History of the Parish of Trinity Church,' and 'The Electoral System of the United States,' by J. Hampden Dougherty.

Marion Crawford, in conjunction with Count Soderini and Professor Clementi, is engaged in the preparation of a life of Leo XIII. on the basis of hitherto unpublished documents, which were personally handed over to Count Soderini by the late Pontiff. The work will fill four volumes, and, according to preliminary reports of those acquainted with the project, will put an altogether different face on the relation of the last two popes to the question of Italian unity.

Interested readers of the article on the new auxiliary language, "Esperanto," by Professor Schinz, in the last number of the *Atlantic*, will be glad of some information regarding text-books. There is a grammar and text-book by O'Connor (to be had of Fleming H. Revell Co., New York), an English-Esperanto dictionary by the same author, and an Esperanto-English dictionary by Matteau. A larger French-Esperanto dictionary (in two volumes of one thousand pages each) is in course of publication. With the building of the great wireless tower in the north of Germany, for communication with all the countries of Europe at once, the necessity for a common *Hilfsprache* becomes manifest. It may be mentioned that at least one American book, an elementary exposition of the modern theory of the continuum by Professor Huntington of Harvard, is about to be translated into Esperanto.

A few reprints deserve mention: the Oxford Edition of Kingsley's 'Westward Ho!' (H. Frowde), with illustrations from books and prints contemporary with the period of the Great Armada; by the same publisher (and, by chance, with an introduction by Walter Raleigh), the 'Lyrical Poems of William Blake,' the text controlled by Blake's latest and best editor, John Sampson—a tasteful volume for the hand; and Spenser's 'Faerie Queene' in two pocket volumes of the Newnes-Scribner Caxton Series, with limp orange covers and paper a shade too thin except for economizing bulk.

The new issue of 'Who's Who in America' (Chicago: A.-N. Marquis & Co.) surpasses its English prototype by nearly 300 pages in extent, and is at once more exclusive (un-foreign) and more democratic if only by reason of its care for authors. The number of persons commemorated is 16,216, and for their addresses, when non-resident, they have been pursued to the uttermost parts of the globe. Of all directories, this is one most often to be thankful for and to resort to. Exemplary in its kind and scrupulously edited, it is, in addition to the biographies, the handiest tracer of a writer's (dated) works and publisher, and in this respect it enjoys a real distinction.

Mr. Frank Maclean's 'Henry Moore, R.A.,' in the "Masters of British Art" (London: Walter Scott; New York: Scribners), is a sound and unpretentious piece of work which will supply all the information that the general reader will care for about this thoroughly competent if not quite great painter. The illustrations are very successfully reproduced, and, in spite of the monotony of subject and the inevitable loss of the glory of color, give one a high opinion of the truth and vigor of Moore's rendering of the open sea, which he was one of the first artists to paint as an independent subject and without reliance on incident or "human interest" of any sort. The scattered allusions through the volume to Moore's brother Albert, whose talent was so different from his own, lead one to long for an equally good account of his life and work. Could not Mr. Maclean give it to us?

There is certainly, nowadays, a strong

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaning among English people of taste and leisure toward the study of old English furniture. In addition to the books we have recently noticed, all bearing upon this subject, and some of great cost and elaboration, we have now (from George Newnes and from Scribner) a less expensive book, 'An Introduction to Old English Furniture,' with a great many illustrations by H. M. Brock and text by W. E. Mallet, who says plainly that he is a dealer. This is so far from being an objection that one rather welcomes the appearance of a treatise written from the furniture-business point of view. Mr. Mallet very civilly calls attention to the most important of the other books upon the subject which are now in course of publication, and speaks as manfully as any collector could speak for purity of taste, for reason and moderation in the desires of the collector, for some independence of changing fashion, and for the consequent saving of fine old pieces from destructive alteration. The one hundred and sixty-eight examples are generally interesting. They are at least such pieces as a private citizen might hope to purchase, and embody designs of suggestive value. But the drawings are not very attractive; they are made with a broad-pointed pen in a too forcible style, leaving little chance for the more delicate details to manifest themselves. The author's brief notes which accompany them are to the point.

Four lectures delivered last year; by Prof. J. S. Nicholson, at the University of Cambridge, have been published under the title of 'Rates and Taxes as affecting Agriculture' (London: Swan Sonnenschein). A good survey of the pressure of taxes upon English landlords and farmers is based upon recent reports and memoranda of the Royal Commissions on Local Taxation and on Agricultural Depression. The author draws upon Dowell's 'History of Taxes' and upon Cannan's 'History of Local Rates' to prove that there is neither legal nor historical foundation for the popular idea that land has always been regarded as a peculiarly appropriate object of heavy taxation. On the contrary, only administrative difficulties have prevented land from enjoying special favors until very recently, when, curiously enough, the clamor for the taxation of unearned increment has come simultaneously with the almost total disappearance of true economic rent. Contending that agricultural rent in England is now simply profit on capital sunk in the land, Professor Nicholson argues against the presumption that the tenant is able to shift the tax upon the landlord. In reality, he claims, both parties share a heavy burden, for the rates are practically a fixed charge, while rent is declining and relief is at present arbitrary and inequitable. While the author proposes no definite scheme, he urges that the reform which must soon come, can be wisely accomplished only by complete reorganization of the whole system of local finance.

The term, "Poultry Farming," adopted by "Home Counties" for the volume published by Dutton, is a misnomer, so far as it implies extensive plants devoted exclusively to the breeding and rearing of domestic fowl. Its true title would be, "Avoid Poultry Farming." The author's purpose is to discourage poultry-raising on a large scale. Therein he shows sound common sense. He favors the system of poultry-keeping in vogue before megalomaniac notions had beset every kind of enterprise whereby a dollar might be earned. Thirty years ago, or even later, such a thing as a poultry farm was unknown. The output of eggs and fowl came from thousands of petty sources—from the twelve to fifty hens kept by country folks and allowed a wide range of territory, where, practically, they found their own living. "Home Counties" favors a return to this system, as a philanthropist eager to save his fellow-men from disaster. To those who may be lured to establish a poultry farm, with its equipment of incubators, brooders, wire-fencing, etc., 'Poultry Farming' may be cordially recommended as a deterrent. "Home Counties" has practical knowledge of his subject. He appears to fear the hostility of agricultural journals and dealers in poultry devices and supplies, by reason of his iconoclastic frankness. He certainly deserves grateful thanks of those who may not have learned the elusiveness of the nimble dollar in reproducing itself when subjected to artificial incubation.

The twenty-third annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology (for 1901-1902) contains, besides the usual administrative statement, an accompanying paper of unusual merit. Mrs. Matilda Coxe Stevenson writes of the Zuñi Indians, their Myths, Esoteric Societies, and Ceremonies. Having accompanied her husband in his many visits to the Zuñi region, Mrs. Stevenson has had a rare and extended opportunity for observation and for seizing upon the spirit of the local beliefs and ceremonies. Together with the general Report come Bulletins 28 and 29, of which the latter is a collection of Indian texts (Haida Texts and Myths, recorded by John R. Swanton), similar to those of Professor Boas already mentioned in these columns. Bulletin 28 originated in Mr. Charles P. Bowditch's interest in American archæology and kindred subjects. Feeling that American scholarship along these lines was hampered by the fact that so much relating to American antiquities was accessible only to the user of foreign languages, he supervised and paid for the translation of the twenty-four papers included in the present Bulletin. The collective title is 'Mexican and Central American Antiquities, Calendar Systems, and History,' the most prominent contributor being Édouard Seler. It seems hardly credible that there are many professional "Americanists" to whom German is a serious barrier; at the same time, we are glad to welcome the translation, especially as it carries with it a collection of material of high value from various sources.

The Carnegie Institution has put forth a classified catalogue of 'Writings on American History, 1903,' a bibliography of books and articles on United States history published in that year, "with some memoranda on other portions of America." The compilers are Andrew C. McLaughlin, William A. Slade, and Ernest D. Lewis. The books or articles are often accompanied by explanatory or appreciative notes, and by reference to leading reviews of them. An index mitigates the inevitable drawbacks of any system of classification.

From the Boston Book Co. we have a fifteen-page pamphlet of 'Abbreviations Used in Book Catalogues,' compiled by Mary Medlicott. A third of the space is given to a list of German technical terms of interest to librarians, mainly derived from the Pratt Institute Bulletin. The same firm sends us a corresponding brochure, 'Material for a Bibliography of Dr. Edmond Halley (1656-1752),' by Alexander J. Rudolph of the Newberry Library, Chicago. We should some time ago have acknowledged receipt of a second revised and enlarged edition of Señor Domingo Figarola-Caneda's 'Bibliografía de Rafael M. Merchán' (Havana, 1905). The compiler is the director of the Biblioteca Nacional, and his subject is an expatriated Cuban littérateur and publicist, whose fame is shared by Colombia, his adopted country. Sr. Figarola-Caneda furnishes a biographical introduction. Merchán was, like all Spanish-American writers, capable of verse as well as an acknowledged poet, but he translated Longfellow's "Evangeline" in prose (Bogotá, 1882). His 'Estudios Críticos' (1886) reprinted an obituary notice of Bryant contributed to a journal of the capital in 1878. The range of his interests was very wide, and is followed minutely by his bibliographer. Besides political and literary themes, he wrote on the education of women, and the last title in the pamphlet before us is a chart for guidance in the printing-office of *La Luz* with respect to purity of language, and for the simplification of typographic composition and correction.

In the initial number of volume eleven of the *Deutsche Juristen-Zeitung* (Berlin: Otto Liebmann) one may read a review of progress in the law for the past decade, accompanied by a very interesting plate of portraits of deceased jurists of the period; Mommsen the most famous of the twenty-eight. Dr. Zorn of Bonn treats of International Conferences, apropos of that now in session at Algeciras; but he does not refer to the American delegation.

Among the noteworthy indications of the intellectual awakening of China is the statement of three Bible societies, the British, Scotch, and American, that their circulation of the Scriptures in that country in 1904 was 2,308,109 copies. The significance of this is strengthened by the fact that the output does not represent mere charitable work, but the demand of the Chinese themselves. Of the more than one million copies circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society, all but 33,273 were sold. Here we may also note the remarkable development of journalism in China. Shanghai, with a population only about two-thirds as great as Boston, has the same number of daily newspapers—nine, four of which are in the Chinese language. Hongkong, just half as large, has ten dailies, including six Chinese. In both places there are a large number of Chinese weeklies. Local dialectic newspapers are being started all over the Empire, and, according to Consul Anderson of Amoy, much of the anti-foreign agitation which has caused so much trouble of late is to be traced to such publications. In addition to these are many Chinese religious papers published by the missionary societies, which have large circulations and are forming an important factor in the regeneration of the educational and social system of the nation. Most of the foreign publications are in English, but there is a French daily and a German weekly at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shanghai, and a Portuguese weekly at Hongkong.

—The 'Sailors' Narratives of Voyages along the New England Coast' published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., and annotated by George Parker Winship, begins with Verrazzano's report to the King of France of his voyage in 1524, and includes the more familiar tales of Gosnold, Pring, Champlain, Waymuth, and John Smith, in chronological order. They are veritable sailor tales of slow voyaging over uncharted seas, anxious approach to unknown shores, and surprising and wonderful adventures of many kinds. These old sailors loved the marvellous, and were quick to believe any extravagant report. So they wrote fascinating tales of the genial climate, the fertile soil, rivers of excelling grandeur and beauty, great park-like groves, and mines of copper and iron, gold and silver. There was an exhilaration in the air of the New World that moved so sober and respectable a man as Pastor Higginson of Salem to write the highly spiced report of "divers thousands of acres of ground as good as need be, and not a tree in the same," and the light-minded Josselyn to tell of moose twelve feet high, with equal spread of antlers, and hens that crowed like cocks. This light-hearted joyousness is most beguiling. It implies happy and prosperous experience, and suggests that Bradford's mournful narrative of the Pilgrim Fathers' voyage and their pathetic first winter need never have been written had the pious Pilgrims been guided by the shrewd sailor wisdom of these men, and sailed from England not on September 6, but months earlier. But there is here also a large portion of sober truth-telling. These old navigators found the Indians a timid and peaceful race for the most part. They made free with their lands, traded craftily, and kidnapped their persons. The naïve story of "poor Christopher Levett" in 1624 bears eloquent witness to the wisdom of decent and Christian regard for them; the later tales of bloody Indian wars are the logical sequel. The editorial work has been skilfully done. The selection of material is judicious, with the single possible exception of the omission of any allusion to the voyages of the Northmen. Capt. John Smith's mention of "morish grasse" on Plum Island (p. 240) is unintelligible. Our own reading, "plaine marish," *i. e.*, marsh ground, is readily understood. Fine paper, large type, maps and facsimiles contribute to the charm of this delightful book.

—Sir George Otto Trevelyan's 'Interludes in Verse and Prose' (London: G. Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan) is an echo from the past, the remote past of the fifties and sixties. On every page there is some allusion to the political or social interests of Londoners and Anglo-Indians and English University men of the day, and some of these interests proved to be so ephemeral that only a contemporary of the author could now do them justice. The parody of the "Ecclesiazousæ" of Aristophanes, for instance, called "Ladies in Parliament," was written in the period of agitation which followed the rejection of Gladstone's Reform Bill of 1866. Lord Russell had entertained John Bright at dinner, and this was the scandal of the London season to which there are witty allusions in the poem. One is thankful for the explanatory footnotes, and as one pores over the passing mention of men and things that mean little or nothing to the reader of to-day, one realizes anew how much political comedy depends on its freshness. If Sir George Trevelyan needs a scholiast, how much of Aristophanes has become pointless forever? Two-thirds of the book are studies of Anglo-Indian life at a time when the rupee had not depreciated, and the writer could say that the career of an Indian civil servant held out the most certain and splendid prospects to ambition. Sir George's father was himself a model of a successful civil servant. But the son, in spite of his interest in Indian affairs, spent only one year in India, as secretary to his father on leaving college. His experiences followed close on the suppression of the Indian Mutiny, and he has written some thrilling pages describing the heroic resistance of a handful of English in the siege of Arrah, now long forgotten by the general public, for whom Cawnpore and Delhi are the classic allusions when the Mutiny is remembered at all.

—Perhaps the best paper in the collection is one which the author delivered as a lecture in Edinburgh in 1865, "An Ancient Greek War." He had promised to lecture on his travels in Greece, but an alarm of cholera checked him at Brindisi, and he substituted for personal experiences this admirable study, which could have been written only by a thorough Greek scholar. Towards the close he has some eloquent pages of panegyric on American valor in the civil war, just ended. "And to think," he says of Robert Gould Shaw and Charles Russell Lowell, "that the very existence of these men—our equals in birth, circumstances, and education—more fortunate than us in that they possessed a cause for which they had a right to labor and suffer—was successfully concealed from us home-staying youth! That we were almost brought to believe that a nation composed of descendants from the Royalist chivalry of the seventeenth century had been subjugated by a heterogeneous mob of aliens officered by political jobbers!" Sir George Trevelyan writing in the sixties, when all educated Englishmen were not so clear-sighted, found in the citizen armies of Sherman and Grant the closest modern parallel to the Athenian militia that fought at Chæronea. "Leonidas and his countrymen, performing their national toilette in preparation for the death which they knew to be inevitable, find a parallel among those veterans in Meade's army who, when their division was ordered on a desperate service, were observed to be silently writing their names upon slips of paper and pinning them to the breasts of their blouses." A fine tribute to Lowell's patriotic poetry closes this paper. The book is attractively printed and bound, and has an excellent portrait of the biographer of Lord Macaulay, taken in 1881.

—Volume eleven of the current 'Meyer's Konversations-Lexikon' (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) concludes the letter K from Kimpolung. In our English alphabet, K is not toothsome, but here it covers a large part of C, as maps not only of Königsberg but of Coblenz, Cologne, Constantinople, and Copenhagen testify. There are long articles on the Child, from kindergarten to juvenile education; songs, diseases, infanticide; and, in connection with one on infant mortality, a shaded map for the German Empire, the Bohemian border lying most in gloom, along with Stettin. The Church is another voluminous rubric. In treating of Colonies, maps are again employed, to show their extension the globe over, and there is a useful table of memorable dates in German colonization, coming down from 1528. As Kitchener's life is sketched without reflections on the Boer war, so Colombia's annals are summed up without characterizing the nature of her deprivation of Panama. Under the Congo State there is allusion to cruelties and oppression, with notice of Leopold's whitewashing committee. Korea is brought up to date and left "a vassal State." There is an odd immediate juxtaposition of Kuroki and Kuropatkin, the one born in 1844, his defeated antagonist in 1848. Which was the better man? On the principle of distinction in warfare, is Kuroki as civilized as Kuropatkin? We read their lives, and find the Russian to be author of a number of valuable military works; Kuroki's fame has no literary roots whatever. The kinematograph, comets, costumes, hospitals, atolls (in which Alexander Agassiz's researches counter to Darwin's theory are not overlooked), war, and art are other topics; while maps not yet named show the lighthouses of the German coast, and criminal statistics for Germany, France, and Italy. There is, finally, a series of portraits of German classics of the nineteenth century, of whom Kleist and Klopstock fall in this highly interesting section of the Lexikon.

—One of the most attractive biographies recently published in Germany is that of Johanna Schopenhauer, by Laura Frost (Berlin: Schwetsche & Sohn). It covers the period from her birth, in 1770, till her death, in 1838. Especially interesting is the record of her residence in Weimar, from 1806 to 1832. Soon after her arrival, Goethe called on her and introduced himself with jocose formality as the "Geheimrath Goethe." He had just married Christiane Vulpius, and thereby excited the anger of the aristocratic circles in Weimar, who refused to receive his wife or recognize her as "Geheimräthin." Frau Schopenhauer put aside this class prejudice with the facetious remark: "If Goethe gave her his name, we might at least give her a cup of tea." Goethe was grateful for this liberal spirit, and became a frequent and welcome guest at her receptions on Sunday and Thursday, where the presence also of Wieland, Falk, Fernow, Prince Pückler, Augustus and Frederick Schlegel, and other persons of distinction rendered her salon celebrated as the resort of the most eminent representatives of German literature and art at that time. She was remarkably cheerful in temperament and optimistic in her views of life, in striking contrast to her son, the misanthropic and pessimistic philosopher, Arthur Schopenhauer. This moral and intellectual antagonism prevented her from appreciating the real scope and value of his writings. When he took his doctor's degree at Jena in 1813, he gave her with justifiable pride a copy of his dissertation: "Ueber die vierfache Wurzel des Satzes vom zureichenden Grunde." "The fourfold root," she ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claimed laughingly; "why, that must be something for apothecaries!" In a deeply injured tone he retorted: "My writings will be read when scarcely a copy of yours can be found in any lumber room." "No doubt," she answered, "the whole edition of your works will always be on hand." Curiously enough, both of these bantering prophecies were in a certain sense fulfilled. For twoscore years his works remained almost wholly unheeded, and scarcely found any sale except as waste paper, while his mother's twenty-six volumes containing chiefly works of fiction and descriptions of travel, although exceedingly popular during her lifetime, are now utterly ignored by the reading public, and actually unknown to the great majority of her countrymen. This is true even of her principal novel, 'Gabriele,' which Goethe speaks of having read with intense interest "in the forests of fir-trees at Marienbad." In 1814 the son demanded of his mother that she should no longer receive an old friend of the family, with whom he had quarrelled. Her refusal to do so led to a final rupture, and they never saw each other again during the remaining twenty-four years of her life. It is strange that a woman whose tact in social life surpassed that of the majority of her sex, should not have used this peculiar quality to prevent or at least to heal such a sad dissension. Her failure in this respect shows how deeply rooted was their mutual aversion.

REHABILITATING AN IDOL.

James Gillespie Blaine. By Edward Stanwood. (American Statesmen; Second Series). Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1905.

"It would be uncandid on the part of the present writer were he to pretend that he possesses the impartiality and the passionless judgment that qualify him to make the final estimate of this man and of his career." These words of Mr. Stanwood, in his closing chapter, are fully borne out by the character of the book itself. We have here what must be characterized as the tribute of an affectionate friend, holding a brief for his subject in an appeal for a rehearing before the rising generation, of certain cases in which an adverse verdict was rendered by the generation now passing from the stage. This marks at the outset a difference perhaps inevitable between the biographies of the former series and those of the men who have risen to prominence in American politics since the civil war. In the former case sufficient time has elapsed to allow of estimates fairly impartial and quite generally acceptable. Such is not the case with the men whose work has been begun and finished within a half-century or less, and especially is this true of James G. Blaine.

As Mr. Stanwood devotes his attention so largely to the effort to break the force of the well-known charges affecting Mr. Blaine's integrity of character, the critic is, of course, forced to consider whether the effort is successful. We may say at once that nothing new is brought forward to warrant any other fundamental interpretation of the admitted facts than that which was reluctantly accepted by many thousands of Blaine's own party friends when the facts were first made public. On the part of those who opposed his elevation to the Presidency after these disclosures were made, Mr. Stanwood imagines a personal animosity which did not exist. The persistent efforts to raise him to that office made it necessary that those who opposed should press their objections with all the vigor and steadfastness at their command, or fail to carry the majority of the people with them. Such failure, in their conscientious opinion, would have had an extremely bad influence on American politics. Such men as Curtis, Lowell, and Schurz were not moved by any personal rancor against Mr. Blaine, but they were deeply moved by the possibility that well-known blemishes in his conduct in high public station might be definitely stamped, by approval at the polls, as no bar to the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Stanwood devotes many pages to the Mulligan letters, but is obliged to say at the end: "No matter which of these views be taken, there will be none to dispute the fact that both the immediate and the remote consequences of his connection with the Little Rock enterprise were terribly out of proportion to any benefit he might have derived from it, had it been successful." But the men who ever afterward successfully held the revelations of these letters up as a bar against Mr. Blaine's progress to the Presidency, were not at all concerned with the financial largeness or littleness of the transactions involved. The lack of a fine sense of honor displayed both directly and by natural implication, all through the letters was what made the trouble. How much of the sensational story of Blaine's recovery of the letters from Mulligan's possession is true is wholly irrelevant, but no one can read them and not understand his intense desire to prevent their publication—a desire so intense as to defeat its own purpose by arousing such suspicion that he was obliged to publish them himself as the less of two evils.

In his suggestion to Fisher to remind Mr. Caldwell of a ruling from the Speaker's chair in favor of the Little Rock interests (the motive of the reminder being to secure a favor from Caldwell to Blaine), Mr. Stanwood finds it difficult to see anything reprehensible unless one is already prejudiced against Mr. Blaine. "The worst that can justly be said of his reference to the proceedings in Congress is well expressed by his own word, *indelicate*." But, granting the best that can be said, will it ever be wise to honor with the Presidency a man whose business correspondence while in high official position has such a fatal tendency to indelicacy? Mr. Stanwood appears to very serious disadvantage in his defence of the letter which Blaine wrote to Mr. Fisher, inclosing a draft of a letter which Fisher was to copy and mail to him, clearing him of any questionable action whatever in the whole Little Rock matter. "His sending a draft letter, and his request that the communication enclosing it should be destroyed, is not inconsistent with absolute innocence of wrong-doing, and can therefore not be used even as cumulative proof that he was guilty of wrong-doing." But the very use to which the letter itself was to be put was dishonest, for its desired effect depended absolutely on producing the utterly false impression that it was the purely voluntary act of Fisher. Mr. Stanwood is obliged to admit that this "voluntary" certificate of innocence, dictated to Mr. Fisher by the alleged culprit to be used in his own defence, omitted mention of circumstances which he wished to keep concealed from his investigators, and that such a statement as Fisher would have made if simply asked for his version of the affair would have been harmful. We do not believe that the time will ever come when a detailed defence of the transactions covered by the Mulligan letters will clear Mr. Blaine's reputation from serious reproach. The record was written with his own hand, and, so far as that part of his life is concerned, the verdict that he himself indirectly rendered by his passionate desire to keep the details of the matter from public scrutiny, will be the verdict of unbiassed posterity, so far as posterity takes the trouble to look at the evidence.

Many eminent men, however, have been subject to similar reproach, but have none the less rendered such transcendent services to their country and their fellow-citizens as to dwarf their temporary lapses practically out of existence by comparison. Is this true of Mr. Blaine? Was he, after all, one of the nation's really great statesmen, so that, after his biography shall have been written, as Senator Hoar suggests, "by a historian with a full and clear sense of his faults and infirmities, concealing nothing and extenuating nothing," we shall still feel that we have a great benefactor of our country, to whose career we may direct the attention of our boys with thankfulness and pride? Our mind turns here to the biography of Lincoln, by the general editor of the same series. What reader of those two notable volumes has not been forcibly struck with the way in which an overwhelmingly great character rises gradually up out of a mass of detail so adverse to our ordinary idea of the natural concomitants of greatness that we are tempted to wonder at times whether we are not reading the words of an intentional traducer? Will the final estimate of Blaine, which Mr. Stanwood has neither written nor seriously attempted to write, present even an approximate resemblance to this?

The question makes it necessary to consider briefly what he actually achieved, and what was the real source of his powerful hold upon the affections of so many men. His biographer admits that, of all the great questions at issue between the parties during his public life, "his name is inseparably connected with not one." But we must look beyond the domain of legislation, we are told. "Blaine's influence during his lifetime, and that which remains, was of a broader and more far-reaching character than can be measured by a consideration of the public acts in which he bore a part. It was an influence upon the general tendency of the political thought of his countrymen." This is vague, and, so far as Mr. Stanwood goes in the way of definite application, we can tie it down to little else than Blaine's early acceptance of some of the ideas underlying our present experiments with Imperialism. But sporadic Imperialists were in evidence long before the advent of Mr. Blaine, nor does it appear that the public mind was prepared for the outbreak of 1898 and its consequences by anything in his life or words. It is not yet determined that the launching of our ship of state on that particular sea will, in the unbiassed judgment

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the future, constitute any valid claim to greatness; but if it should, there are much less worthy characters than Mr. Blaine whose memories will be entitled to a larger share. Of the various lines of political thought rife in his time, that which so far has been the most fruitful was the desire for administrative reform in the conduct of our Government, which found its expression chiefly through the mouths of eminent Republicans who afterwards became his most effective opponents. What was his attitude toward that thought? We get it from his own lips, when he writes to President Garfield of "the Reformers by profession, noisy but not numerous, pharisaical but not practical, ambitious but not wise, pretentious but not powerful. They can be easily dealt with, and can be hitched to your Administration with ease." No biographer will ever be able to show for the writer of these words a genetic relation to the great reform movement which is the dominant feature in the political thought of to-day. On the tariff question, notwithstanding his dramatic interference in behalf of the addition of a reciprocity clause to the McKinley bill, we find no evidence of any such accession of fundamental enlightenment as came, though late, to McKinley himself. That the best thought of the day, in both parties, is surging rapidly forward to a successful grapple with the abuses of tariff taxation, is scarcely doubted even by the well-informed among the "stand-patters" themselves. In this movement no great positive influence will ever be traced to the career of Mr. Blaine. It is no prejudice, but the simple want of all evidence of any such positive achievement or influence as is necessary to substantiate a claim to real greatness, that must lead open-minded students of American history to reject the claim.

We have referred to his estimate of himself in the Little Rock transaction, as implied in his desire to suppress the evidence. Mr. Stanwood incidentally supplies us with another implied self-estimate. Of Butler's candidacy in 1884 Mr. Stanwood says, "His political career in Massachusetts showed that he could attract voters of a certain class who were to be found in both parties, and were a credit to neither." Of this vote Blaine wrote to Elkins, "If Butler runs, he will get 250,000 votes, more or less—less, probably. If he does not run, who will get a majority of those votes? I think I would, and hence would gain by his staying out." There is more sagacity here than in his imagining, at an earlier date, that he could command the support of the reformers.

His brilliant conversational power and engaging manner explain readily enough his ability to secure a firm hold upon most of his party associates with whom he came into personal contact, as well as upon many of his political opponents. His biographer gropes rather unsuccessfully for any adequate explanation of his hold upon the thousands of his almost frantically enthusiastic supporters with whom he never did come into personal contact. Perhaps it is well to remember that large classes of people occasionally do things, or display emotions, for which there really is no adequate explanation. The pages of history do not show that genuine greatness of statesmanship is prone to be the generator of wild enthusiasm. The student of Mr. Blaine's "popularity" will go astray if he does not consider carefully its abrupt limitations as well as its intensity. The significant fact was, that where men were most given to thinking outside the trammels of party dictation, there this wonderful popularity met with the most severe checks. In general, such popularity as admittedly great men have attained has run on lines almost opposite to this. Doubtless this seems a mystery to the thorough-going Blaine devotee, and with him we are content to leave it.

To many students of his career, Mr. Blaine appears at his best in his 'Twenty Years of Congress.' He can see the better traits in Jefferson's career far more clearly than many in whom blind partisanship is far less excusable, and his vigorous indictment of his own party for its course in the impeachment proceedings against President Johnson does him credit, especially when we remember that at the time he allowed the storm of party passion to sweep him off his feet along with the rest, and voted for the impeachment resolutions in the House. Mr. Stanwood's enthusiasm carries him beyond bounds, however, when he says that "No other book covering any period of American political history is so full and comprehensive, or displays such intimate knowledge of men and events." While we may admit Blaine's advantage in personal acquaintance with the men of whom he writes, to compare his volumes in point of fulness and comprehensiveness with the work of James Ford Rhodes, for instance, would be absurd.

Mr. Stanwood's attitude towards the leaders of the Independent movement against Blaine's candidacy for the Presidency is an interesting study. He is too intelligent an observer to take the more common position of the Blaine devotee that they were simply a coterie of wicked slanderers. He admits their high degree of intelligence and their thorough honesty of purpose. Blaine's own contempt for them he distinctly does not approve. He agrees with Senator Hoar, however, that the Independent is more severe upon those whom he supposes guilty of any serious delinquency than are the critics in the opposite party, and this seems to puzzle him as it did the Senator. If this be true, why should any one object? It is good Rooseveltian theory that a fiery vigor against all that is wrong in a political party is the best service which can be rendered to that party. The critics of the opposition party may be seeking mere partisan advantage, and are heavily handicapped by the natural suspicion of insincerity; the Independent, or the critic within the party, is much more apt to be moved by conscientious motives, and is therefore more earnest and more effective. Again, Mr. Stanwood lingers over the fact that most of the Independent leaders were free traders, and never again became regular adherents of the Republican party. He cannot accuse them of opposing Blaine because they were free traders, and yet—they were free traders. Why does he not open the window to which he stands so near and learn the truth that for many years now anything whatever that arouses independent political thought, has been working to the detriment of the high-tariff theory—that only the shackles of partisanship can keep its nominal defenders from deserting in such numbers as to make its capitulation a necessity?

In conclusion, we are forced to say that this book can hardly fail to harm the general series to which it belongs. From Mr. Stanwood's point of view, no one could have made a better presentation of his subject than he has made, but it is a point of view somewhat new to the "American Statesmen" series. It was perfectly allowable that this point of view should be presented, but an entirely independent presentation would have been preferable. If the series in question really needed a life of Blaine, it would have been better to select a biographer both presumably and really capable of entire personal detachment. The first group, closing with the civil war, made a very fair approximation to the acceptable "final estimate." It will certainly suffer if it is to be followed under the same general title by volumes partaking so largely either of ardent eulogy or of labored defence, and the more so when the two are united.

HISTORY OF ENGLISH PHILANTHROPY.

A History of English Philanthropy from the Dissolution of the Monasteries to the Taking of the First Census. By B. Kirkman Gray. London: P. S. King & Son. 1905.

Mr. Kirkman Gray has got hold of a fruitful idea, but he has not fully mastered it, and therefore has been unable to give it adequate expression. The original idea, which lends value to a treatise filled with information, is that English philanthropy has a distinct history of its own, and that the progress and development of philanthropic effort have been in England, as elsewhere, demonstrably connected with the development of thought. Our author has attempted to trace the connection in England between the humanity whereof the main object is to relieve or avert physical pain, and variations in public opinion. The existence of this connection is certain. The pity for suffering is in one sense, indeed, the same in all ages, though it is far more intense during some periods of human history than during others. But the form which this compassion takes and the methods by which it attempts to achieve its ends, vary infinitely, and this variation is always connected with the general beliefs, religious, moral, and social, prevalent in a given country at a given era. That this is so will in a general way be admitted by any one who has bestowed the least attention upon the connection between thought and action. But whoever will read with care Mr. Gray's treatise, will see at once that a conclusion which it is easy to arrive at on a-priori grounds, is established with certainty by an examination into the annals of English charity. At one time gifts to the poor, whether made during a man's lifetime or under his will after his death, had a two-fold object. They were meant partly to relieve the miseries of poverty, but in part also to lighten the purgatorial sufferings of the donor. Before the beginning of the seventeenth century, Englishmen had

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceased to believe in purgatory, and the sole object of gifts to the poor was the alleviation of earthly want.

Contrast, again, under the guidance of our author, the philanthropy which belonged to the age of Elizabeth and of the Stuarts, with the philanthropy which characterized the close of the seventeenth and the greater part of the eighteenth century. Benevolence during the earlier era was governed by the idea—very imperfectly carried out—that it was the function of the State to relieve or ward off distress. It is only recently that inquirers have realized that, for good or evil, the Privy Council, as the representative of the Crown, attempted under James I. and, till the outbreak of the Civil War, under his son to enforce the carrying out of the poor-law for the benefit, or at any rate the supposed benefit, of the poor. This effort, indeed, may be looked upon from very different points of view. It meets, as we gather from his tone, with the approval of Mr. Gray. It appears to a judicious inquirer such as Mr. T. Mackay, who still adheres to the faith of Bentham and of the reformers of 1834, to have been noxious, and in fact to have gone far towards the promotion of practices which by 1830 threatened the pauperization of the English laboring classes. Whichever be the right view, one thing is certain: the idea of State duty which prevailed during the sixteenth and until about the middle of the seventeenth century, succumbed before the very different beliefs which gained increasing force throughout the course of the eighteenth century.

Men did not grow less benevolent. The contemporaries of Johnson were a good deal more humane than the contemporaries of Elizabeth or of Charles I. No one can imagine that Johnson, enemy as he was of Dissenters, would have welcomed a law which sanctioned the cropping of a Nonconformist's ears. But whilst humanity had increased, the belief in State intervention had decreased. Charity had become rather a private than a Governmental concern, and Mr. Gray well calls attention to a circumstance which was at once the consequence, and also in part the cause, of this change of opinion. No one supposed that isolated individuals could give that aid to the poor or the sick which the State, in the case of the poor at any rate, attempted to provide in the form of poor-relief. But it was found that the joint-stock principle, which did such good work in the extension of trade, might also be applicable to philanthropic objects. The ideas of the counting-house (many of them, be it said, very sound ideas) were applied to the exercise of charity. There is no part of the 'History of English Philanthropy' so well worth reading as the chapters devoted to establishing, by an infinity of examples, the fact that societies for the founding of hospitals, for the relief of debtors, for the care of foundlings, for the erection of reformatories, penitentiaries, and an endless number of institutions supported by public subscriptions, gave effect to the constantly increasing humanity of the eighteenth century.

Let us look now at another example, provided by our author, of the relation between opinion and public benevolence. In a chapter entitled "Revolution: Thrift and Soup," he insists upon the peculiar characteristics of that school of philanthropists of whom one of the best known is Hannah More. Their distinguishing trait is that, while sharing the ardent humanity which was the glory of the eighteenth century, they participated to the full in the reaction which, on moral no less than on political grounds, condemned the French Revolution and its principles. They were at once fervent philanthropists and panic-stricken Tories. Hence a singular mixture of charity and fear. The men and women who devoted their lives to the service of the poor, were in constant dread of the alleged rights of the people. Their benevolence was undoubted, their teaching was often full of good sense, but their philanthropy savored of didacticism. Soup kitchens were connected with the distribution of tracts, and occasionally attendance at church was made the condition on which depended gifts of bread. In the case of individuals, and certainly of Hannah More, one may be certain that an enthusiastic desire to benefit the bodies no less than the souls of laboring men was the real source of devotion to their interests. But there is no need to deny that the religious public of 1790 or of 1800 considered both charity and religious teaching to be safeguards against revolutionary principles; the study of the Bible was the best antidote to the reading of Tom Paine's 'Age of Reason.' With the high virtues and the comparatively slight defects of these Tory philanthropists we need not here concern ourselves. All that must be noted is that the peculiarities marking a particular form of benevolence are clearly connected with the beliefs of a particular era. We may even go a step further than does Mr. Gray. We may assert a conclusion to which his whole treatise leads, but which he does not emphasize, that the exercise of philanthropy is merely one part, though a very important part, of social action, and, like legislation, with which it is intimately connected, is in reality always the result of dominant public opinion.

Here we see the one defect in Mr. Gray's treatment of a fruitful conception. He has not perceived its whole bearing; still less has he been able to give full expression to the idea of which his whole treatise is in reality the illustration. He is too much immersed in details. For the information he supplies about almshouses, hospitals, and the like, or about early attempts to realize in practice ideals which savor of Socialism, all readers may feel grateful. But the facts he unearths derive their real value from being illustrations of certain principles, or at any rate of certain states of opinion. Yet Mr. Gray never seems able fully to grasp the principles or conditions of belief which his facts illustrate. At all events, he shows very little power of bringing ideas into connection with history. A writer who purports to trace the course of philanthropy, cannot attain his end by merely providing us with a lot of useful information about the growth of different kinds of benevolent institutions. Still, though Mr. Gray has not in our judgment fully accomplished the object which he wished to attain, and has not marked with anything like sufficient clearness the essential and vital differences between the philanthropic ideas prevalent at different eras, his book may easily in this respect be improved in the later editions through which it is certain to pass. We have pleasure, then, in acknowledging that a work which suffers somewhat from not giving due prominence to one leading thought that ought to pervade every page of it, is yet full of facts and ideas which are preeminently suggestive. It is, for example, a great thing that the public should be made to realize that the attempt of the first two Stuarts to establish something very like political despotism, was closely connected with an administrative system meant to benefit the poor. It is not amiss that speculative admiration for Puritanism by men who would have loathed the tyranny of the saints, should be corrected by the knowledge that Puritanism, for a time, at any rate, checked rather than promoted philanthropy. It is a good thing for us all to learn that the prosaic labors of the eighteenth century laid the foundation for the mass of philanthropic associations which have, with all their defects, done much to mitigate the sufferings of the sick and the needy and have done still more to humanize the sentiments of the healthy and the rich Few things are more instructive than the way in which we can trace, through English history in the past, variations in the estimate of the relative merit of State intervention on the one hand, and of individual effort on the other. At a time when it appears pretty certain that new experiments in the direction of Socialism will be pressed or forced upon the English Parliament and the English people, it is of benefit to learn from the undoubted facts of history put forward by a writer who excels rather in the accumulation of information than in the enunciation of theories, that neither the ideas of Socialism nor the problems which they are intended to meet are new, and that in England these problems have been partially met by exerting the powers of the State, but still more frequently by the combined efforts of individuals. A history of English philanthropy in the past affords some, though perhaps rather dubious, guidance to a generaton of Englishmen who seek to determine what in the immediate future shall be the path of philanthropic effort.

The Abolitionists: Together with Personal Memories of the Struggle for Human Rights, 1830-64. By John F. Hume. Putnams. 1905.

The author of this weighty and dispassionate little essay might have adopted for its epigraph the verse of the protagonist in the great conflict—

"I am an Abolitionist!
I glory in the name."

His text is a passage from Theodore Roosevelt's biography of Benton in the American Statesmen series, twenty years ago, condemnatory alike of the Abolitionists proper—the purely moral agitators—and of the Liberty party, the political seceders from the former body. Mr. Roosevelt approves of nothing back of the Republican party. The Abolitionists "have been credited with deeds done by other men whom, in reality, they hampered and opposed rather than aided." After 1840, "much of what they did was positively harmful to the cause for which they were fighting." "The Liberty party, in running Birney, simply committed a political crime, evil in almost all its consequences. They in no sense paved the way for the Republican party, or helped

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forward the anti-slavery cause, or hurt the existing organizations. . . . Lincoln in 1860 occupied more nearly the ground held by Clay than that held by Birney. . . . The Liberty party was not in any sense the precursor of the Republican party, which was based as much on expediency as on abstract right, and was therefore able to accomplish good instead of harm."

Mr. Hume, an Ohioan by origin, of legal training, the political editor of the *Missouri Democrat* on the eve of and during the civil war, has felt Mr. Roosevelt's utter want of sympathy with the Abolitionists, and has been moved to recall and vindicate their noble and disinterested and self-sacrificing labors. He further insists upon a genetic relation between the Liberty party and the Republican party. His criticism is agreeably interspersed with personal reminiscences, and his work is a salutary recall of thoughtful minds to a first-hand study of the actors in the mighty moral drama of 1830-1865. He uses the term Abolitionists too loosely, indeed—almost as loosely as the lords of the lash themselves, who knew no distinction between the anti-slavery sentiment of Garrison, Birney, and Lincoln—anathema all. And in his main thesis he is far from exhausting the subject of the evolution of political anti-slavery organization. He comes nearer to sharp definition in chapter xix., "The End of Abolitionism" (p. 150):

"The original and distinctive Abolition movement that was directed against slavery in all parts of the land without regard to State or Territorial lines, and because it was assumed to be wrong in principle and practice, may be said, so far as the country at large was concerned, to have culminated at the advent of the Republican party. To a considerable extent it disappeared, but its disappearance was that of one stream flowing into or united with another. The union of the two currents extended, but did not intensify, the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country. It diluted it and really weakened it. It brought about a crisis of great peril to the cause of Anti-Slaveryism—in some respects the most critical through which it was called upon to pass. Many of those attaching themselves to the Republican party . . . were not in sympathy with the Abolitionists. They were utterly opposed to immediate emancipation; or, for that matter, to emancipation of any kind. They wanted slavery to remain where it was, and were perfectly willing that it should be undisturbed. . . . One of these men was Abraham Lincoln, whom I heard declare in his debate with Douglas at Alton, Illinois: 'I was with the Old-Line Whigs from the origin to the end of their party.' The Whigs were never an Anti-Slavery party. . . . These men largely dominated the new party. They generally dictated its platforms, which, compared with earlier Abolition utterances, were extremely timid, and they had much to do with making party nominations."

This is perfectly just, as any one may perceive who reverts to the party's attitude towards compromise and the Peace Congress in January, 1861. But the Liberty party is chargeable with a corresponding defection from and limitation of the aims of the Abolitionists proper. In 1847 Wendell Phillips wrote to an English correspondent:

"Our old enemy, Liberty Party, is fulfilling, oh, how exactly! our prophecies in 1840. . . . We said she would be obliged to adopt more than one principle (hatred to slavery) before she would increase. Lo! Goodell and all New York have confessed it, and joined the Democrats on Free Trade, the Land Reformers on Land Limitation, etc., etc.—19 points in all. . . . It was prophesied that the party would be obliged to desert its main principle, separate organization, in any real anti-slavery struggle. It did so in the only two it has met—in New York, on the Constitution [of 1846]; in New Hampshire, on J. P. Hale's election. It was prophesied that when pressed it would be forced to gain strength by selecting for candidates men not of their party. Leavitt, desirous to equal Goodell, is about to select Hale as their Presidential candidate—a man never of their party. It was prophesied that so fast as men became politicians, they would cease to be frank-spoken, active reformers; and so it has proved. Liberty party, *as such*, is dying, and merging under other names in other movements."

In its inception the Liberty party, though exchanging a concrete for an abstract denomination, professed no other aim than its members had pursued as Immediate Abolitionists—an aggressive policy of emancipation, but through political agencies. The Free Soil party was already shrunken and on the defensive, as its name showed: its chief concern was to stop the extension of slavery. The Republican party chose a neutral name, and was ready to go to the lowest depths of concession in order to avert civil war. It was the residuum of successive sheddings of the pure faith expounded in the *Liberator*.

We can dilate no further on this topic, and as to others we must refer our readers to the book itself, which deserves the widest circulation and calm pondering. We conclude with a few unconnected pregnant extracts:

"The slave-owners were numerically a lean minority even in the South, but their mastery over their fellow-citizens was absolute. Nor was there any mystery about it. As the owners of four million slaves, on an average worth not far from five hundred dollars each, they formed the greatest industrial combination—what at this time we should call a Trust—ever known to this or any other country" (p. 32).

"And what has the political party which, in view of its manifold professions, was supposed to have the interests of the negro in its especial keeping, done about it [disfranchisement since the war]? Nothing whatever. It has looked on with the coolest indifference" (p. 81).

"It used to be our boast that Freedom followed our flag. Now slavery [in the Philippines] follows it" (p. 84).

"On all questions affecting human liberty, no one can fail to observe that the attitude of the two great political parties of to-day is practically that of the two principal parties at the time the Abolitionists began their operations. One of them may pass perfunctory resolutions against the Philippine crime, but dares to say nothing about the treatment visited upon the negro. The other may say a few compassionate, but meaningless, words for the negro, but cannot denounce the oppression of the Filipinos. Both are fatally handicapped by their connections and committals. Both are, in fact, pro-slavery, although the one in power, because of its responsibility for existing conditions, is the more criminal of the two" (p. 86).

"If a stranger who knew nothing of the speakers [Lincoln and Douglas at Alton in 1858] and their party associations had heard the two men on that occasion, he would have concluded that one was strongly in favor of slavery and the other was not opposed to it" (p. 96).

"Had the Rebels been shrewd enough, within the hundred days [following the Emancipation Proclamation], to take the President at his word, he would have stood pledged to maintain their institution; and his proclamation, instead of being a charter of freedom, would have been a license for slaveholding" (p. 138).

"Notwithstanding various unfriendly references of an academic sort to that institution, he [Lincoln] was not at the time the proclamation appeared, and never had been, an Abolitionist" (p. 139).

"The conclusion is inevitable that his [Lincoln's] fame as a statesman will ultimately depend less upon his treatment of the slavery issue than upon any other part of his public administration" (p. 147).

The two authoritative chapters on Missouri, written from inside knowledge, are of great importance to the historian, and are especially not to be neglected by any future biographer of Lincoln. We stay our pen with the remark that such a defence as this of the Abolitionists curiously gives no certain evidence of the author's ever having read the history *par excellence* of that body.

English Domestic Architecture of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries: A Selection of Examples of Smaller Buildings, Measured, Drawn, and Photographed, with an Introduction and Notes, by Horace Field and Michael Bunney. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1905. Quarto, pp. xiv., 76; many text illustrations and 118 plates.

The authors of this book express, at the outset, their wish to deal with the smaller dwellings of the epoch from the middle of the seventeenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century, or thereabout. They point out how the "English Renaissance," as they call it, has been dealt with of late rather fully, and mention their own dealings with the "less important buildings of this time" as having been undertaken especially to complete the needed investigation. They say that they hope to interest those who know the work of the period, as well as "many others who have never studied it and are therefore ignorant of [its] simple and dignified character." Those are safe words to use, but they are also just and sufficient words. It is a specialty of English architecture that it compares with that of the Continent as the small and unpretending compares with the stately. It has the faults of a cheap and simple fashion of building, but it has its virtues, too, and virtues which appeal very strongly to the modern and to the American taste as regards external architecture. It is truly "simple and dignified" in spite of its small scale and inexpensive treatment. The English cathedral is not high in the ridge, broad in the nave, and yet of overwhelming altitude within in proportion to the width of the nave. It is not mysterious nor bewildering nor overwhelming: and in like manner the English mansion house does not rival a royal palace in its method of design, as do so many châteaus of the sixteenth, and so many of the nineteenth, century. So with the smaller houses as they are discussed in this book: one of the more important of them is the newer wing of Castleton Hall, near Rochdale, Lancashire, with five windows in each story, two full stories, and a row of dormers in the roof. Of this it is said that the material was "little sympathetic to the refined mouldings and accurate masonry which Renaissance architecture required. . . . The local sandstone has been used for the walling, and the dressings made out of millstone grit, as has always been the case." The large scale of the building is commented on; and by this is meant that the win-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dows of the ground story are 11 feet high and 5 feet wide in the clear, and the whole height of the two-storied wall 29 feet above the base course—not a very palatial scale, after all!

We quarrel with our authors very often for their neglect to tell us about the material; but no one who knows the moderate-sized English house, new or old, will believe that these big modillions of Castleton Hall and the cornice they carry are of any material other than wood. If they are of wood, though, should not the authors of the excellent introduction, with its sagacious remarks about sincerity in design, have mentioned the fact to regret it? For assuredly this is a stone mason's idea; these cornices are based upon stone building, they are copied from the cut-stone architecture of the Continent. So that here in this very example the merit and the less acceptable character of English work are at once fairly set forth; indeed, English cheapness of structure and simplicity of aim have never been found quite apart from forgeries of the sort here suggested, with carpenter work and plaster work doing duty for cut stone.

The building named above is given us only in an elevation with some details (Pl. xxi.). There are, however, many photographic plates, some showing each one large building, three or four having two or even three buildings apiece in little separate pictures. The last plate of all arrays four doorways of interesting character, chosen in four little old towns whose very names are like a journey in the Midlands and thence to the South coast—Warminster, Painswick, Stanford, Dingley, and Chichester.

One marked feature is the presence, among the photographs, of views in the streets of towns. These are pretty and make one long to go and live in them or opposite to them. "A house near the church, Painswick, Glos." is the subject of Plate x. "Samuel Salter's house, Trowbridge, Wilts," occupies Plate xv., and has in Plate xvi. a line drawing, an elevation of its front. Plate xxiv. represents "The Ship, a commercial hotel at Mere, Wilts"; and here both sides of the street are seen as it goes curving away, affording by its layout a good opportunity for the camera. All these and the five-score buildings, more or less, which come into the scope of the book, are treated with the briefest possible verbal description. The short notices are devoted almost wholly to comments upon the material; and if any word about the design is ventured, it is a word and little more. There is, however, an excellent Introduction of eight pages, a chapter of nineteen pages dealing with "The Renaissance Evolution in England," and a preliminary essay on the illustrations, preceding the separate notes devoted to them. The matter of this text is perfectly well thought out and expressed. The book is a valuable one from every point of view.

India and the Apostle Thomas: An Inquiry. With a Critical Analysis of the 'Acta Thomæ.' By A. E. Medlycott, Bishop of Tricomia. London: David Nutt. 1905.

Conducted in a scholarly spirit, temperate in tone, and with full references to authorities, Bishop Medlycott's fresh investigation of the vexed question regarding St. Thomas's work in India will be welcomed by all Church historians. It is impossible to give detailed arguments here, but a brief statement of the various theses maintained in this book will be of interest. St. Thomas made two distinct expeditions to India. The first was to the Indo-Parthian frontier. After being summoned back to the place where the Virgin Mary was about to die, he undertook another mission to southwestern India, whence he went to the Coromandel coast. There, near Madras, he founded a church which survived for several centuries, until the persecuted disciples fled to the western settlement. The Saint's remains were transferred to Edessa between the years 202-241. Calamina, where the Saint died, is a foreign form of Kâlâh [Khalam, Colon], *elmina* (port), 'Qualah-the-harbor.' After the seventh century this name took the place in Occidental recitals of the real name of the little town now called San Thomé, but originally Mylapore (Ptolemy's Maliarpha). Calamina has nothing to do with south Persian Karmân, as maintained by W. R. Philipps. St. Thomas's sojourn in Southern India is inferentially proved by testimony of the fourth and sixth centuries. St. Pantænus (the rival "first apostle to India") was never in India! The Thomas who was a disciple of Menes was not in India at all, as Theodoret asserts, but in Syria (Judæa) as affirmed by still older tradition. We believe the bishop to be right in this.

Historians of India will wonder, however, at some of these positions. Mr. Vincent Smith, whose 'Early History of India' was published last year, holds that while St. Thomas's mission to Parthia is credible, the connection with South India is a late Nestorian invention, without older authority than that of Marco Polo (thirteenth century). Bishop Medlycott now shows that Theophilus (fourth century) probably visited India and found a Hindu colony of Christians. Again, in the sixth century, the Theodore cited by the Bishop of Tours saw a Christian church, a monastery, and a church festival under conditions reconcilable only with the climate of South India. Bishop Medlycott decidedly scores when he says that Calamina could not have been Karmân, or the local Nestorians would have had the legend of St. Thomas's martyrdom. His own etymology, though, seems too fanciful to be true.

St. Thomas is a picturesque figure. Not content with India, he converted Ethiopia and several other parts of the earth. The best description of his mission is given in the 'Acta Thomæ.' He was not at all inclined to accept the service which Christ bade him undertake. "Whithersoever thou wilt, O Lord," he said, "send me; only to India *I will not go*"! Finally, however, he went, pretending to be an architect, since Gondophares, King of Parthia, had sent for some one to build him a palace, and this seemed to be a good opening. The Saint spent all the money received for building the palace on the poor; then, when the day of reckoning came and the King asked where his palace was, he replied, "I have built you a palace—in heaven." Bishop Medlycott supposes that after this the Saint went to Socotra, passed from there to the mainland, and so eventually reached the eastern coast. Tradition certainly has it that the savages of Socotra centuries later claimed to be descendants of the Saint's first disciples, and who can disprove the tradition? As for the rest, it is not at all improbable that the legend of the Southern mission is much older than the thirteenth century. If the 'Acta' revert to the second century, some mission to India has that respectable antiquity: but the 'Acta' are not in their original form, and details of description found therein may not be of so great value as Bishop Medlycott opines. If, however, the Saint himself—who bears to India somewhat the relation that St. Patrick bears to Ireland, the little matter of snakes excepted—takes any interest in the matter, he will have the Bishop of Tricomia to thank for the ablest presentation yet made in favor of the famous mission to Southern India.

The Bishop's book gives an excellent résumé of the whole discussion and contains a store of documents not easily accessible. In his analysis of the 'Acta' and criticism of (Ptolemy's Maliarpha in) McCrindle's 'Ancient India,' the author's philological skill is worthily employed. A map showing the various routes followed by the apostle would have been of service to the general reader, who would probably be interested also in a list of the radically different languages—Semitic, Aryan, Dravidian, Ethiopic—and dialects which the Saint must have employed on his various tours.

Round About My Peking Garden. By Mrs. Archibald Little. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1905.

Archibald Little, whose recent work on China, economic and physiographic, was recently reviewed in this journal, and his wife deserve the hearty thanks of all who would understand the Chinese as human beings like ourselves. The Chinaman of seventeenth-century French fancy, the ogre of the British opium-seller, the creature imagined by sand-lots orators, and the bogy dreamed of by land-hungry Emperors is a phantasy of one sort. The actual product in humanity of ages of peculiar physical and mental environment is a reality worthy of study. It is to the credit of Mr. Little that, after forty-five years of honorable activity in China, he has been able to picture a land and people with insight, sympathy and justice, while for twenty years his wife has been a helpmeet for him. Educated by her father, and rich in experiences of every sort in China, she has labored, possibly more than any other one woman, at the task of bringing into accord of mutual helpfulness the womanhood of China and of Christendom, and her works praise her in the gates. Behind this book about flowers, architecture, and travel, there is a notable personality. At the outset, one can see that the volume has not been put together, as is so often sadly the case, in some book-manufacturer's office, and illustrated with such material as the clerks and salesmen of the house might pick out from a miscellaneous collection of photographs bought in shops. More than four-score illustrations, here rendered with accuracy and spirit, show the author's own taste and skill in selection, she choosing the subjects outdoors and indoors, and handling her own apparatus. Hence the mass of delightful and edifying illustration,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which powerfully reinforces the text, giving even a *blasé* reader fresh impressions, as of a new China, discoverable only by sympathetic eyes, while yet as realistic as sun-pictures make it. Even when stock subjects are touched by her pen or camera, the effect is that of a discovery.

Instead of a preface, Mrs. Little gives us an introduction entitled "Peking Revisited: An Anniversary Study of August, 1900." Vividly photographing, in word and picture, that awful carnival of loot and devastation, as well as the belated supremacy of discipline, Mrs. Little handsomely appraises, discerns, and lauds the efforts of civilized officers to restrain the outbursts of elemental passions. She is optimistic, though not as the fool, about the promised good to come, at least in the twenty-first century. She saw the Court come back, and her opinion is fixed about the Empress Dowager, as a woman who has an iron will, with abundant resources of mental strength. Very pleasantly does she chat about Pekinese dogs of rare breed, and tell of goldfishes with telescopic eyes and triple, lace-like tails. She takes us where the Great Wall dips its mighty toe into the sea, and gossips about seaside resorts; then to the Imperial Hot Springs and the Ming tombs, and further to Kalgan and the Mongolian grass land, and comes back again to Peking palaces to tell us about Lama and Confucian temples, with others of many sorts and varieties. There seems to be something like a permanent Congress of Religions in Peking, but there is nothing under Government patronage but Confucianism. Examination halls and the ways of students are also treated of with sprightliness, with a chapter on the soldiers of five nations in China, her criticisms being both original and quoted. She mourns that her English brethren, so apt to follow in old ruts, are so slow to learn new things, though she does not admire the Germans. Of the American soldier she says: "The man is equal to his officer, and speaks to him as such. His needs are so great that the commissariat stores are a miniature army and navy co-operative; and it is impossible to move them far or quickly." A visit to Port Arthur shows how it looked before the devastations of war. Dalny, the fiat city, morass of finance and edifice of graft, with its harlequin architecture, is also described. On the missionary question, Mrs. Little's judgment is not that of a closet critic or hasty tourist. She speaks with a knowledge not born of the club or hong, but of the long-resident traveller and level-headed coöperator with those who, whether lay or clerical, "live in pulses stirred to generosity, . . . in scorn for miserable aims that end with self."

There is an index and a glossary.

The Farce of Master Pierre Patelin. Composed by an Unknown Author about 1469 A. D. Englished by Richard Holbrook. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1905.

At length, after near 450 years of waiting, this little masterpiece appears for the first time in an English dress. Mr. S. F. G. Whitaker, it is true, has recently published an English "Patelin," but his version was taken from the "faked" and transformed text of the Abbé Brueys. Mr. Holbrook's version is from the genuine text as given in the earliest printed edition, that of 1486, but a few years later than its composition.

The title follows the French editions in calling "Patelin" a "farce"; but really it is an exquisite little bourgeois comedy. There is nothing of the farce proper about it—no exaggeration nor grimace; the personages, though comic, may very well have been drawn from the life. The perfection of the simple plot, the ease of the handling, the crispness and neatness of the dialogue, show the literary artist; and we can hardly charge Fournier with exaggeration when he calls it "l'œuvre capitale de notre théâtre comique avant Molière." Though it seems to have enjoyed great popularity from the time of its appearance, the author is unknown. He was evidently one familiar with the law courts, and was most probably one of the clerks of the Basoche, who had almost a monopoly of the comic drama in the fifteenth century. It was almost certainly written in Paris, though the scene is laid in some provincial town not specified. From the "pawkiness" of the shepherd, we should conjecture Normandy.

The translator has well accomplished a difficult task: difficult not merely on account of obscurities of phrase and allusion, but from the necessity of reproducing the ease and sprightliness of the dialogue without losing the antique color. Idioms—many of which would be unintelligible if literally translated—he has tried to represent by idioms; as, for example, *avocat dessoubz l'orme* by "briefless barrister." But when he renders a fifteenth-century phrase by the most modern slang: for instance, *Dieu en soit loué*, by "Now you're talking"; *Il luy faut or—on le luy fourre*, by "He must have gold: he shall get it—in the sweet by and by"; *Dictes, je vous pry, sans sorner*, by "I say; please, no kidding"; *Par le sang bleu!* by "Great guns!"—one is conscious of something like a jar.

The edition is enriched by the spirited woodcuts of Pierre Levet (1490) and by a description of the stage-setting adopted at the Comédie-Française. If the translator had given the French text in an appendix, it would have been a boon to students; but we are very thankful for the book as it is.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Axel and Valborg. Translated by Frederick S. Kolle. The Grafton Press.
Beecher, Henry Ward. Sermon Briefs. Boston: The Pilgrim Press.
Bell, Malcolm. Old Pewter. Imported by Scribners. $2.50 net.
Bell, Raicy Husted. Words of the Wood. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.
Carroll, B. H. Political History of Europe. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press. $2.
Chronicles of London. Edited by Charles L. Kingsford. Henry Frowde. 10s. 6d.
Deutsches Zeitgenossen-Lexikon. Lemcke & Buechner.
Evans, Herbert A. Highways and Byways in Oxford and the Cotswolds. Macmillan Co. $2.
Field, Horace, and Michael Bunny. English Domestic Architecture of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century. Macmillan Co. $15 net.
Fitchett, W. H. The Unrealized Logic of Religion. Eaton & Mains. $1.25 net.
Goddard, Dwight. Eminent Engineers. The Derry-Collard Co.
Guerville, A. B. de. New Egypt. Dutton. $5 net.
Haldane, Elizabeth. Descartes: His Life and Times. Dutton. $4.50 net.
Hare, Augustus J. C., and St. Clair Baddeley. Sicily. Dutton. $1.
Kinard, James P. English Grammar for Beginners. Macmillan Co. 50 cents.
Little, Arthur W. The Times and the Teaching of John Wesley. Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co. 40 cents net.
Lyman, Olin L. Micky. Boston: Richard G. Badger. $1.25.
Madan, A. C. Senga Handbook. Henry Frowde.
Mazzotto, Domenico. Wireless Telegraphy and Telephony. Translated by S. R. Bottone. Macmillan Co.
Moore, George. The Lake. Appleton. $1.50.
Moriarty, Catherine. Friendship's Fragrant Fancies. Dodge Publishing Co.
Most Popular Home Songs, The. Selected by Gilbert C. Noble. Hinds, Noble & Eldredge.
Needham, Raymond, and Alexander Webster. Somerset House, Past and Present. Dutton. $3.50 net.
Palmer, Erastus, and L. Walter Sammis. The Principles of Oral English. Macmillan Co. 60 cents.
Payne, John, Selections from the Poetry of. Made by Tracy and Lucy Robinson. John Lane Co. $2.50 net.
Perry, Thomas Sergeant. John Fiske. (The Beacon Biographies.) Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.
Phillpotts, Eden. The Portreeve. Macmillan Co. $1.50.
Philosophische Abhandlungen: Max Heinze zum 70. Geburtstage. Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn.
Poultry Farming. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.25.
Prevention and Cure of Tuberculosis. Compiled by Joseph R. Long. Denver: H. M. Brinker. $1.25.
Proctor, Mary. Giant Sun and his Family. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Rowell, George Presbury. Forty Years an Advertising Agent. Printers' Ink Publishing Co.
Rowe, Stuart H. The Physical Nature of the Child. Macmillan Co. 90 cents.
Russell Wheeler Davenport. Putnams. $1.25 net.
Saleeby, C. W. Evolution the Master-Key. Harpers. $2 net.
Sauter, Edwin. The Faithless Favorite. St. Louis: Published by the Author.
Shand, Alexander Innes. Days of the Past: A Medley of Memories. Dutton. $3 net.
Sicnarf. The Past and the Present. The Neale Publishing Co.
Singer, H. W. James McNeill Whistler. Imported by Scribners. $1 net.
Sollas, W. J. The Age of the Earth. Dutton. $3 net.
Songs of Mother and Child. Collected and arranged by Lida B. McMurry and Agnes C. Gale. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Stapleton, Mrs. Bryan. A History of the Post-Reformation Catholic Missions in Oxfordshire. Henry Frowde.
Steel, F. A. A Book of Mortals. Macmillan Co. $3.
Strachan, James. Hebrew Ideals. Imported by Scribners. 60 cents net.
Suttner, Baroness Bertha von. Ground Arms! Translated by Alice A. Abbott. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.25.
Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Vol. XIX. London.
Willard, Charles Dwight. City Government for Young People. Macmillan Co. 50 cents.
Wise, John S. A Treatise on American Citizenship. Northport, L. I.: Edward Thompson Co.
Wright, Thomas Wallace. The Adjustment of Observations. D. Van Nostrand Co. $3 net.

Lankaster's Extinct Animals

Profusely illustrated. $1.75 net (by mail $1.92).

"A charming book . . . the greatest learning combined with the utmost simplicity of expression . . . a book of intense interest."—*N. Y. Sun.*

"Would have taxed Huxley himself to talk as simply, instructively, and delightfully to young people . . . most lively reading for young or old."—*N. Y. Globe*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

Beethoven—Franklin—Rousseau:

KRUELL'S Portraits, wood-engraved in the highest manner of the art and printed on Japan paper, size 9x11 inches, market price Twenty Dollars each, now offered *at half rate* to subscribers on the books of the *Nation*, and sent, carriage free, on receipt of Ten Dollars.—Address

PUBLISHER OF THE NATION, New York.

DO YOU ADVERTISE? Then you can gain invaluable assistance towards effective results from our book, THE THEORY OF ADVERTISING. Price, postpaid, $2.15. Send for it to-day.

SMALL, MAYNARD & COMPANY
31 Arrow Street Cambridge, Mass.

SCIENCE AND A FUTURE LIFE
By Prof. JAMES H. HYSLOP
$1.50 net. Postage 12 cents extra.
HERBERT B. TURNER & CO., Boston

SELECTIONS FROM THE POETRY OF
JOHN PAYNE
By T. & L. ROBINSON
JOHN LANE CO., The Bodley Head, N. Y.

DEFINITE OFFERS OF BOOKS and Periodicals solicited by
A. S. CLARK, Peekskill, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED